arXiv:math/0312109v3 [math.OA] 1 Mar 2005

TOPOLOGICAL QUIVERS

PAUL S. MUHLY AND MARK TOMFORDE

Abstract. Topological quivers are generalizations of directed graphs in which the sets of vertices and edges are locally compact Hausdorff spaces. Associated to such a topological quiver $\mathcal{Q}$ is a C^*-correspondence, and from this correspondence one may construct a Cuntz-Pimsner algebra $C^*(\mathcal{Q})$. In this paper we develop the general theory of topological quiver C^*-algebras and show how certain C^*-algebras found in the literature may be viewed from this general perspective. In particular, we show that C^*-algebras of topological quivers generalize the well-studied class of graph C^*-algebras and in analogy with that theory much of the operator algebra structure of $C^*(\mathcal{Q})$ can be determined from $\mathcal{Q}$. We also show that many fundamental results from the theory of graph C^*-algebras have natural analogues in the context of topological quivers (often with more involved proofs). These include the Gauge-Invariant Uniqueness theorem, the Cuntz-Krieger Uniqueness theorem, descriptions of the ideal structure, and conditions for simplicity.

1. Introduction

In recent years directed graphs have played an important role in the construction and analysis of C^*-algebras. The virtue of describing a C^*-algebra in terms of a graph lies in the fact that many abstract properties of the C^*-algebra correspond to easily manageable and computable parameters of the graph. Furthermore, this description not only gives a useful perspective for studying certain classes of C^*-algebras, but also provides a method for easily producing C^*-algebras with particular properties.

Many C^*-algebras, such as Cuntz algebras and Cuntz-Krieger algebras, are defined in terms of generators that satisfy relations which may be directly represented in terms of such graphs. For other C^*-algebras, including some that arise in representation theory (see [37, 38, 42]) and the theory of quantum spaces (see [23, 24]), it is an issue of considerable importance in their analysis to determine how they may be represented by a graph. At the same time, there are numerous C^*-algebras resembling Cuntz algebras and Cuntz-Krieger algebras that may be profitably analyzed in terms of structures that might well be called "continuous graphs"; that is, graphs whose spaces of vertices and edges are topological spaces.

Date: February 1, 2008.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 46L55; Secondary: 46L08.

Key words and phrases. C^*-algebras, topological quivers, Cuntz-Pimsner algebras, graph algebras, C^*-correspondences.

The first author was supported by NSF Grant DMS-0070405 and the second author was supported by NSF Postdoctoral Fellowship DMS-0201960.

To our knowledge, the first studies along this line are due to Deaconu (see [8, 9, 10, 11]) who was interested in groupoid representations of Cuntz-like C^*-algebras associated to (non-invertible) maps of topological spaces, i.e. to *endomorphisms* of $C_0(X)$. However, there are some measure-theoretic antecedents due, in particular, to Vershik and Arzumanian [50, 2, 3] where endomorphisms of L^∞-spaces were investigated. The Arzumanian-Vershik-Deaconu program was taken up by a number of people and from a variety of viewpoints, but the groupoid perspective was put into final form in the work of Arzumanian and Renault [1, 49]. Deaconu's results were the most definitive in the setting where the endomorphisms considered came from covering maps.

This led Deaconu and the first author of this paper to investigate in [12] whether one can extend the groupoid analysis of endomorphisms of $C_0(X)$ to the setting where the endomorphism is induced by a *branched* covering. It turned out, however, that this is not possible — at least not without some modifications. Branch points cause difficulties with building a Haar system for the groupoid. The modification proposed in [12] was simply to excise the branch set, and to focus on the groupoid coming from the local homeomorphism that is defined on its complement. While some information is lost in this process, a rich structure remains and a C^*-algebra may be constructed that codifies the dynamics of the local homeomorphism and reflects at least some of the properties of the branch set. In order to study this C^*-algebra, and in particular to compute its K-theory, the authors found it beneficial to use technology pioneered by Pimsner in his seminal paper [44] in order to realize the C^*-algebra as what is nowadays called a Cuntz-Pimsner algebra. Pimsner's work, in turn, was profoundly influenced by the theory of certain graph C^*-algebras (viz. Cuntz-Krieger algebras) and the interactions between his theory and graph C^*-algebras continues — independent of the current investigation.

To glimpse the connections among branched coverings, Cuntz-Pimsner algebras, and graphs, consider the very simple case where the space X is compact (e.g. the 2-sphere) and the map f is a branched covering of X with finitely many branch points (e.g. a rational function). We then obtain a graph by letting X be both the set of vertices and the set of edges. The source of x, when x is viewed as an edge, is simply x thought of as a vertex; i.e., the source map is the identity. The range of x, when x is viewed as an edge, is simply the point $f(x)$ in X, viewed as a vertex. That is, the range map is f. In this way we have a graph; however, there is an additional bit of structure which plays an important role for us: Since the map f is open by the definition of 'branched covering' (see [12, Definition 2.1]), we may apply general theory [6] to assert that for each $x \in X$, there is a measure λ_x with support $f^{-1}(x)$ such that for each $\xi \in C(X)$ the function $x \mapsto \int \xi(t)\, d\lambda_x(t)$ is also in $C(X)$. Of course, in our special setting, where there are only finitely many branch points, λ_x may be taken to be counting measure on $f^{-1}(x)$ when x is a regular point, and a suitable weighted counting measure on $f^{-1}(x)$ when x is a branch point. In fact, when X is the 2-sphere and f is a rational map, Kajiwara and Watatani [27] have identified the weights in terms of the so-called "branching index" of f. The family of measures $\{\lambda_x\}_{x\in X}$ forms what is known in the literature as a *(full) f-system* [48, p. 69]; it is closely related to the notion of a *transfer function* which Exel used to study crossed products of $C(X)$ (and other C^*-algebras) by endomorphisms via Cuntz-Pimsner algebras [16, 17]. With this data the space $C(X)$ may be viewed both as a C^*-algebra and as a "correspondence" or "Hilbert bimodule" $\mathcal{X}$ over

$C(X)$. The left action of $C(X)$ on $\mathcal{X}$ is just pointwise multiplication, while the right action is induced by f and given by $\xi \cdot a(x) := \xi(x)a(f(x))$. The $C(X)$-valued inner product on $\mathcal{X}$ is given by the formula

$$\langle \xi, \eta \rangle (x) = \int \overline{\xi(t)} \eta(t) \, d\lambda_x(t), \tag{1.1}$$

for $\xi, \eta \in \mathcal{X}$. With this bimodule structure, work of Pimsner enables one to construct a C^*-algebra, $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{X})$, which, when the map f is a homeomorphism, is the transformation group C^*-algebra, $C^*(X, \mathbb{Z}, f)$.

Inspired by the example of branched coverings and other considerations, the first author and Solel introduced the notion of a *topological quiver* [40]. This is a quintuple $\mathcal{Q} = (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$, where E^0 and E^1 are locally compact Hausdorff spaces, r and s are continuous maps from E^1 to E^0 with r open, and $\lambda = \{\lambda_v\}_{v \in E^0}$ is an r-system. Thus, from a purely set-theoretic perspective, $\mathcal{Q}$ is a graph. The r-system is added to enable one to replace sums that arise in the graph theoretic setting with integrals. The term "topological quiver" was adopted out of deference to the ring-theoretic use of the term "quiver" which was introduced by Gabriel in [22] to describe the graph associated to a so-called basic algebra. There is a bijective correspondence between (hereditary) basic algebras and graphs, and nowadays the term "quiver" is universally used to refer graphs in the ring theoretic setting.

The space $C_0(E^0)$ is, of course, a C^*-algebra and $C_c(E^1)$ becomes a pre-C^*-correspondence over $C_0(E^0)$ in the following way: The module actions are given by the formulae

$$a \cdot \xi(\alpha) := a(s(\alpha))\xi(\alpha) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \xi \cdot a(\alpha) := \xi(\alpha)a(r(\alpha)),$$

and the inner product is given by Eq. 1.1. The completion $\mathcal{X}$ of $C_c(E^1)$ in the norm coming from the inner product is a C^*-correspondence over $C_0(E^0)$ and the Cuntz-Pimsner algebra of $\mathcal{X}$, $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{X})$, was one of the objects of study in [40]. It is clear that our analysis of branched coverings fits into this broader framework. Also, if $\mathcal{Q} = (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ is an ordinary graph, so that E^0 and E^1 are discrete spaces and λ consists of counting measures, then $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{X})$ is the usual graph C^*-algebra associated to $\mathcal{Q}$ that has been so thoroughly investigated in recent years. (To be a bit more precise, one has to modify Pimsner's original definition of $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{X})$ slightly to capture the C^*-algebra of a graph due to possible "sinks" in the graph. However, we shall take up this subtlety later.)

Our objective in this paper is to pick up where [40] left off by establishing basic facts about topological quiver algebras, analyzing parallels with the theory of ordinary graph C^*-algebras, and highlighting novelties of the theory that result from the imposition of topological constraints. In one sense, one would certainly expect strong parallels with the theory of graph C^*-algebras. However, as we have found, when parallels exist the proofs are often much more difficult. Also, differences between discrete spaces and general locally compact Hausdorff spaces must of course be taken into consideration. How to do this is our focus.

We want to call attention here to two other papers that were inspired, at least in part, by [12] and [40], and which have some overlap with this paper. The first is the important study by Katsura [28], where topological quivers $(E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ with the property that r is a *local homeomorphism* are investigated. In Katsura's setting, λ is taken to be counting measures on the fibers of r. As we shall see in our study, the places where r is a local homeomorphism are closely related to notion of "regular vertices" in the setting of graph C^*-algebras. The second paper that has some overlap with our study is the preprint of Brenken [7]. He considers quivers $(E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ where the edge set E^1 is a closed subset of $E^0 \times E^0$. The maps r and s are the projections of this set into E^0. He considers a number of very interesting examples, but from the point of view of general theory, his study has little in common with ours.

This paper is organized as follows. After some preliminaries in §2 we continue in §3 with a formal definition of a topological quiver as well as a description of the associated C^*-correspondence and C^*-algebra. In §4 we show how one can add tails to topological quivers in order to deal with sinks, and we state a Gauge-Invariant Uniqueness Theorem. In §5 we give conditions for the C^*-algebra of a topological quiver to be unital, and we describe how to form its minimal unitization when it is not. In §6 we give an analogue of Condition (L) used for graphs, and we prove a Cuntz-Krieger Uniqueness Theorem for C^*-algebras of topological quivers. In §7 we describe "relative quiver C^*-algebras" (in analogy with relative Cuntz-Pimsner algebras) and we use these objects in §8, together with the Gauge-Invariant Uniqueness Theorem, to give a complete description of the structure of a quiver algebra's gauge-invariant ideals. In §9 we give sufficient conditions for all ideals in the C^*-algebra of a topological quiver to be gauge-invariant, and we develop an analogue of Condition (K) used for graphs. We conclude in §10 by giving necessary and sufficient conditions for an arbitrary quiver C^*-algebra to be simple.

Acknowledgments: The authors would like to thank Takeshi Katsura for many useful conversations regarding the work in this paper.

Notation and Conventions: If S is a subset of a topological space we write $\overline{S}$ for its closure and $\operatorname{Int} S$ for its interior. If f is a continuous function we write $\operatorname{osupp} f := \{x : f(x) \neq 0\}$ for the open support of f, and we write $\operatorname{supp} f := \overline{\{x : f(x) \neq 0\}}$ for the closed support of f. Also, all locally compact Hausdorff spaces we consider will be second countable. Hence they will be metrizable and normal, and we will make frequent use of Urysohn's Lemma and the Tietze Extension Theorem. If V is a normed space with norm $\|\cdot\|$, we write $\overline{V}^{\|\cdot\|}$ for the completion of V with respect to the norm $\|\cdot\|$. In general, when M is a subobject of N, we write q^M for the quotient map of N into N/M. We shall also adopt the standard notation for Hilbert C^*-modules used by Lance in [36].

2. Preliminaries

Definition 2.1. If A is a C^*-algebra, then a *right Hilbert A-module* is a Banach space X together with a right action of A on X and an A-valued inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_A$ satisfying

(i) $\langle \xi, \eta a \rangle_A = \langle \xi, \eta \rangle_A a$
(ii) $\langle \xi, \eta \rangle_A = \langle \eta, \xi \rangle_A^*$
(iii) $\langle \xi, \xi \rangle_A \geq 0$ and $\|\xi\| = \langle \xi, \xi \rangle_A^{1/2}$

for all $\xi, \eta \in X$ and $a \in A$. For a Hilbert A-module X we let $\mathcal{L}(X)$ denote the C^*-algebra of adjointable operators on X, and we let $\mathcal{K}(X)$ denote the closed two-sided ideal of compact operators given by

$$\mathcal{K}(X) := \overline{\operatorname{span}}\{\Theta^X_{\xi,\eta} : \xi, \eta \in X\}$$

where $\Theta^X_{\xi,\eta}$ is defined by $\Theta^X_{\xi,\eta}(\zeta) := \xi\langle\eta,\zeta\rangle_A$. When no confusion arises we shall often omit the superscript and write $\Theta_{\xi,\eta}$ in place of $\Theta^X_{\xi,\eta}$.

Definition 2.2. If A is a C^*-algebra, then a *C^*-correspondence* is a right Hilbert A-module X together with a $*$-homomorphism $\phi : A \to \mathcal{L}(X)$. We consider ϕ as giving a left action of A on X by setting $a \cdot x := \phi(a)x$.

Definition 2.3. If X is a C^*-correspondence over A, then a *Toeplitz representation* of X into a C^*-algebra B is a pair (ψ, π) consisting of a linear map $\psi : X \to B$ and a $*$-homomorphism $\pi : A \to B$ satisfying

(i) $\psi(\xi)^*\psi(\eta) = \pi(\langle\xi,\eta\rangle_A)$
(ii) $\psi(\phi(a)\xi) = \pi(a)\psi(\xi)$
(iii) $\psi(\xi a) = \psi(\xi)\pi(a)$

for all $\xi, \eta \in X$ and $a \in A$.

Note that Condition (iii) follows from Condition (i) due to the equation

$$\|\psi(\xi)\pi(a) - \psi(\xi a)\|^2 = \|(\psi(\xi)\pi(a) - \psi(\xi a))^*(\psi(\xi)\pi(a) - \psi(\xi a))\| = 0.$$

If (ψ, π) is a Toeplitz representation of X into a C^*-algebra B, we let $C^*(\psi, \pi)$ denote the C^*-algebra generated by $\psi(X) \cup \pi(A)$.

A Toeplitz representation (ψ, π) is said to be *injective* if π is injective. Note that in this case ψ will be isometric since

$$\|\psi(\xi)\|^2 = \|\psi(\xi)^*\psi(\xi)\| = \|\pi(\langle\xi,\xi\rangle_A)\| = \|\langle\xi,\xi\rangle_A\| = \|\xi\|^2.$$

When (ψ, π) is a Toeplitz representation of X into $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ for a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$, we say that (ψ, π) is *a Toeplitz representation of X on $\mathcal{H}$.*

Definition 2.4. For a Toeplitz representation (ψ, π) of a C^*-correspondence X on B there exists a $*$-homomorphism $\pi^{(1)} : \mathcal{K}(X) \to B$ with the property that

$$\pi^{(1)}(\Theta_{\xi,\eta}) = \psi(\xi)\psi(\eta)^*.$$

See [44, p. 202], [26, Lemma 2.2], and [20, Remark 1.7] for details on the existence of this $*$-homomorphism. Also note that if (ψ, π) is an injective Toeplitz representation, then $\pi^{(1)}$ will be injective as well [20, Proposition 1.6(2)].

Definition 2.5. For an ideal I in a C^*-algebra A we define

$$I^\perp := \{a \in A : ab = 0 \text{ for all } b \in I\}$$

and we refer to $I^\perp$ as the *annihilator of I in A.* If X is a C^*-correspondence over A, we define an ideal $J(X)$ of A by

$$J(X) := \phi^{-1}(\mathcal{K}(X)).$$

We also define an ideal J_X of A by

$$J_X := J(X) \cap (\ker\phi)^\perp.$$

Note that $J_X = J(X)$ when ϕ is injective, and that J_X is the maximal ideal on which the restriction of ϕ is an injection into $\mathcal{K}(X)$.

If (ψ, π) is a Toeplitz representation of X in a C^*-algebra B, then the following are some elementary properties of $\pi^{(1)}$ that we shall use:

1. $\pi^{(1)}(T)\psi(\xi) = \psi(T\xi)$ for all $T \in \mathcal{K}(X)$ and $\xi \in X$.
2. $\pi^{(1)}(\phi(a))\psi(\xi) = \pi(a)\psi(\xi)$ for all $a \in J(X)$ and $\xi \in X$.

(3) $\pi^{(1)}(\phi(a))\pi(b) = \pi^{(1)}(\phi(ab))$ and $\pi(b)\pi^{(1)}(\phi(a)) = \pi^{(1)}(\phi(ba))$ for all $a \in J(X)$ and $b \in A$.

(4) If $\rho : B \to C$ is a homomorphism of C^*-algebras, then $(\rho \circ \psi, \rho \circ \pi)$ is a Toeplitz representation and $(\rho \circ \pi)^{(1)} = \rho \circ \pi^{(1)}$.

Definition 2.6. If X is a C^*-correspondence over A and K is an ideal in $J(X)$, then we say that a Toeplitz representation (ψ, π) is *coisometric on* K if

$$\pi^{(1)}(\phi(a)) = \pi(a) \qquad \text{for all } a \in K.$$

We say that a Toeplitz representation (ψ_X, π_A) which is coisometric on K is *universal* if whenever (ψ, π) is a Toeplitz representation of X into a C^*-algebra B which is coisometric K, then there exists a $*$-homomorphism $\rho_{(\psi,\pi)} : C^*(\psi_X, \pi_A) \to B$ with the property that $\psi = \rho_{(\psi,\pi)} \circ \psi_X$ and $\pi = \rho_{(\psi,\pi)} \circ \pi_A$.

Definition 2.7. If X is a C^*-correspondence over A and K is an ideal in $J(X)$, then the *relative Cuntz-Pimsner algebra determined by* K, which we shall denote $\mathcal{O}(K, X)$, is the C^*-algebra $C^*(\psi_X, \pi_A)$ where (ψ_X, π_A) is a universal Toeplitz representation of X which is coisometric on K. The existence of $\mathcal{O}(K, X)$ is proven in [19, Proposition 1.3].

Remark 2.8. If $\mathcal{O}(K, X)$ is a relative Cuntz-Pimsner algebra associated to a C^*-correspondence X, and if (ψ, π) is a universal Toeplitz representation of X which is coisometric on K, then for any $z \in \mathbb{T}$ we have that $(z\psi, \pi)$ is also a universal Toeplitz representation which is coisometric on K. Hence by the universal property, there exists a homomorphism $\gamma_z : \mathcal{O}(K, X) \to \mathcal{O}(K, X)$ such that $\gamma_z(\pi(a)) = \pi(a)$ for all $a \in A$ and $\gamma_z(\psi(\xi)) = z\psi(\xi)$ for all $\xi \in X$. Since $\gamma_{z^{-1}}$ is an inverse for this homomorphism, we see that γ_z is an automorphism. Thus we have an action $\gamma : \mathbb{T} \to \operatorname{Aut} \mathcal{O}(K, X)$ with the property that $\gamma_z(\pi(a)) = \pi(a)$ and $\gamma_z(\psi(\xi)) = \psi(\xi)$. Furthermore, a routine $\epsilon/3$ argument shows that γ is strongly continuous. We call γ the *gauge action on* $\mathcal{O}(K, X)$.

Lemma 2.9. *Let X be a C^*-correspondence, let K be an ideal in J_X and let (ψ, π) be a universal Toeplitz representation which is coisometric on K. If $b \in J(X)$ and $\pi(b) = \pi^{(1)}(\phi(b))$, then $b \in K$.*

Proof. Throughout this proof we will use the notation established in [39, §2]. Let ϕ denote the left action of A on X, and let $\mathcal{F}(X) := \bigoplus_{k=0}^{\infty} X^{\otimes k}$ denote the Fock space of X. Also let (T, ϕ_∞) denote the universal Toeplitz representation of X in $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{F}(X))$ given by

$$\phi_\infty(a) := \operatorname{diag}(a, \phi(a), \phi^{(2)}(a), \ldots) \qquad \text{and} \qquad T(\xi) := T_\xi$$

where T_ξ is the "creation operator" on $\mathcal{F}(X)$. If P_0 denotes projection in $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{F}(X))$ that maps $\mathcal{F}(X)$ onto the first summand of $\mathcal{F}(X)$, then [39, Lemma 2.17] shows that

$$a \in J(X) \qquad \text{if and only if} \qquad \phi_\infty^{(1)}(\phi(a)) = \phi_\infty(a) - P_0\phi_\infty(a).$$

Since (ψ, π) is a Toeplitz representation of X into $C^*(\psi, \pi)$ there exists a homomorphism $\psi \times_0 \pi : \mathcal{T}_X \to C^*(\psi, \pi)$ with

$$(\psi \times_0 \pi) \circ T = \psi \qquad \text{and} \qquad (\psi \times_0 \pi) \circ \phi_\infty = \pi.$$

But then $\pi^{(1)} = (\psi \times_0 \pi) \circ \phi_\infty^{(1)}$ and consequently

$$(\psi \times_0 \pi)(P_0\phi_\infty(b)) = (\psi \times_0 \pi)(\phi_\infty(b) - \phi_\infty^{(1)}(\phi(b)))$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= \pi(b) - \pi^{(1)}(\phi(b)) \\
&= 0. \qquad (2.1)
\end{aligned}
$$

The kernel of $\psi \times_0 \pi$ is equal to the ideal in $\mathcal{T}_X$ generated by $\{\phi_\infty(a) - \phi_\infty^{(1)}(\phi(a)) : a \in K\} = \{P_0\phi_\infty(a) : a \in K\}$ (see the proof of [19, Proposition 1.3]). Thus (2.1) implies that $P_0\phi_\infty(b)$ is the limit of sums of elements of the form

$$T_{\xi_1} \dots T_{\xi_n} \phi_\infty(a) T_{\eta_1}^* \dots T_{\eta_m}^* \qquad \text{for } \xi_1, \dots \xi_n, \eta_1, \dots, \eta_m \in X \text{ and } a \in K. \tag{2.2}$$

But since

$$T_{\xi_1} \dots T_{\xi_n} \phi_\infty(a) T_{\eta_1}^* \dots T_{\eta_m}^* = \begin{pmatrix} 0_{n\times m} & * \\ * & * \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$P_0\phi_\infty(a) = \operatorname{diag}(a, 0, 0, \dots)$$

the only way this can occur is if $n = m = 0$ and there are no T_ξ's and no T_η's in the term shown in (2.2). Thus $P_0\phi_\infty(b)$ is equal to $P_0\phi_\infty(a)$ for some $a \in K$. Since $P_0\phi_\infty(a) = \operatorname{diag}(a, 0, 0, \dots)$ and $P_0\phi_\infty(b) = \operatorname{diag}(b, 0, 0, \dots)$ this implies that $b = a \in K$. ☐

Lemma 2.10. *Let X be a C^*-correspondence, and let (ψ, π) be an injective Toeplitz representation of X. If $a \in A$ and $\pi(a) \in \operatorname{im} \pi^{(1)}$, then $a \in J(X)$ and $\pi(a) = \pi^{(1)}(\phi(a))$.*

Proof. Since $\pi(a) \in \operatorname{im} \pi^{(1)}$ we know that $\pi(a) = \pi^{(1)}(T)$ for some $T \in \mathcal{K}(X)$. But then for every $\xi \in X$ we have

$$\psi(T\xi) = \pi^{(1)}(T)\psi(\xi) = \pi(a)\psi(\xi) = \psi(\phi(a)\xi).$$

Because (ψ, π) is injective, it follows that ψ is isometric and thus $T\xi = \phi(a)\xi$ for all $\xi \in X$. Hence $\phi(a) = T \in \mathcal{K}(X)$ and $\pi(a) = \pi^{(1)}(T) = \pi^{(1)}(\phi(a))$. ☐

Lemma 2.11. *Let X be a C^*-correspondence, and let (ψ, π) be an injective Toeplitz representation of X. If $a, b \in J_X$ and $\pi^{(1)}(\phi(a)) = \pi^{(1)}(\phi(b))$, then $a = b$.*

Proof. Since π is injective, it follows from [20, Proposition 1.6(2)] that $\pi^{(1)}$ is injective. Thus $\phi(a) = \phi(b)$ and $a - b \in \ker \phi$, and since $a - b \in J_X$ and $J_X \cap \ker \phi = \{0\}$, it follows that $a = b$. ☐

Definition 2.12. If X is a C^*-correspondence, then we define *the Cuntz-Pimsner algebra of* X to be $\mathcal{O}_X := \mathcal{O}(J_X, X)$; that is, $\mathcal{O}_X$ is equal to the C^*-algebra $C^*(\psi_X, \pi_A)$ where (ψ_X, π_A) is a universal Toeplitz representation of X which is coisometric on J_X.

Remark 2.13. The C^*-algebra $\mathcal{O}_X$ is unique up to isomorphism. Furthermore, if X is a C^*-correspondence in which ϕ is injective, then $\mathcal{O}_X := \mathcal{O}(J_X, X)$ is equal to the augmented C^*-algebra of X defined by Pimsner in [44, Remark 1.2(3)]. If X is also full; i.e. $\overline{\operatorname{span}}\{\langle \xi, \eta \rangle_A : \xi, \eta \in X\} = A$, then the augmented C^*-algebra of X and the C^*-algebra of X defined by Pimsner in [44, Definition 1.1] coincide. Thus $\mathcal{O}_X$ is equal to the C^*-algebra studied by Pimsner in [44] when ϕ is injective and X is full.

Remark 2.14. Pimsner originally defined the C^*-algebra $\mathcal{O}_X$ under the hypothesis that the left action ϕ is injective. In this case $\mathcal{O}_X = \mathcal{O}(J(X), X)$ (since $J(X) = J_X$ when $\ker \phi = \{0\}$). In subsequent work by other authors, it was proposed that the algebra $\mathcal{O}(J(X), X)$ should serve as the analogue of the Cuntz-Pimsner algebra in the case when ϕ is not injective. However, this definition has been found to be deficient, and in the recent work of Katsura [29, 30, 31] it has been shown that $\mathcal{O}(J_X, X)$ is a more appropriate analogue in the general setting. We refer the reader to the work of Katsura as well as the introduction of [41] for a more detailed explanation of why $\mathcal{O}(J_X, X)$ is the appropriate definition for the general Cuntz-Pimsner algebra.

2.1. **Graph C^*-algebras.**

Definition 2.15. If $E = (E^0, E^1, r, s)$ is a directed graph consisting of a countable set of vertices E^0, a countable set of edges E^1, and maps $r, s : E^1 \to E^0$ identifying the range and source of each edge, then the graph algebra $C^*(E)$ is defined to be the universal C^*-algebra generated by mutually orthogonal projections $\{p_v : v \in E^0\}$ and partial isometries $\{s_e : e \in E^1\}$ with mutually orthogonal ranges that satisfy

(1) $s_e^* s_e = p_{r(e)}$ for all $e \in E^1$

(2) $p_v = \displaystyle\sum_{\{e \in E^1 : s(e) = v\}} s_e s_e^*$ for all $v \in E^0$ with $0 < |s^{-1}(v)| < \infty$

(3) $s_e s_e^* \leq p_{s(e)}$ for all $e \in E^1$.

Definition 2.16 (The Graph C^*-correspondence). If $E = (E^0, E^1, r, s)$ is a graph, we define $A := C_0(E^0)$ and

$$X(E) := \{x : E^1 \to \mathbb{C} \ : \ \text{the function } v \mapsto \sum_{\{f \in E^1 : r(f) = v\}} |x(f)|^2 \text{ is in } C_0(E^0) \ \}.$$

Then $X(E)$ is a C^*-correspondence over A with the operations

$$(x \cdot a)(f) := x(f) a(r(f)) \text{ for } f \in E^1$$

$$\langle x, y \rangle_A(v) := \sum_{\{f \in E^1 : r(f) = v\}} \overline{x(f)} y(f) \text{ for } f \in E^1$$

$$(a \cdot x)(f) := a(s(f)) x(f) \text{ for } f \in E^1$$

and we call $X(E)$ the *graph C^*-correspondence* associated to E. Note that we could write $X(E) = \bigoplus_{v \in E^0}^0 \ell^2(r^{-1}(v))$ where this denotes the C_0 direct sum (sometimes called the restricted sum) of the $\ell^2(r^{-1}(v))$'s. Also note that $X(E)$ and A are spanned by the point masses $\{\delta_f : f \in E^1\}$ and $\{\delta_v : v \in E^0\}$, respectively.

Remark 2.17. If $E = (E^0, E^1, r, s)$ is a graph and $X(E)$ is the associated graph C^*-correspondence, then it is a fact that $C^*(E) \cong \mathcal{O}_{X(E)} := \mathcal{O}(J_{X(E)}, X(E))$. It was proven in [18, Proposition 12] that if E has no sinks, then $C^*(E) \cong \mathcal{O}(J(X(E)), X(E))$, and a very similar proof can be used to show that in general $C^*(E) \cong \mathcal{O}(J_{X(E)}, X(E))$. (We mention that E has no sinks if and only if the left action of $X(E)$ is injective.)

3. TOPOLOGICAL QUIVERS

Definition 3.1. A *topological quiver* is a quintuple $\mathcal{Q} = (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ consisting of a second countable locally compact Hausdorff space E^0 (whose elements are called vertices), a second countable locally compact Hausdorff space E^1 (whose elements are called edges), a continuous open map $r : E^1 \to E^0$, a continuous map $s : E^1 \to E^0$, and a family of Radon measures $\lambda = \{\lambda_v\}_{v \in E^0}$ on E^1 satisfying the following two conditions:

1. $\operatorname{supp} \lambda_v = r^{-1}(v)$ for all $v \in E^0$
2. $v \mapsto \int_{E^1} \xi(\alpha) d\lambda_v(\alpha)$ is an element of $C_c(E^0)$ for all $\xi \in C_c(E^1)$.

The term topological quiver was used in [40, Example 5.4] where it was explained that the nomenclature "quiver" was chosen because of the relation of the notion to ring theory where finite directed graphs are called quivers.

It is important the reader realize that in the literature pertaining to graph C^*-algebras and their generalizations, various authors will interchange the roles of the maps r and s in their definitions. Our choice in Definition 3.1 agrees with that used in most papers on graph C^*-algebras (cf. [35, 34, 5, 4]). However, our choice differs from that used in the higher rank graph algebras of Kumjian and Pask [32, 33] and from that used in the topological graph algebras of Katsura [28]. It is also different from the choice used in the original definition of a topological quiver given in [40, Example 5.4].

We mention that if one is given E^0, E^1, r, and s as described in Definition 3.1, then it follows from [6, Lemma 3.3] that there always exists a family of Radon measures $\lambda = \{\lambda_v\}_{v \in E^0}$ satisfying Conditions (1) and (2) (this existence relies on the fact that E^1 is second countable). However, in general this choice of λ is not unique. We also point out that given any family $\lambda = \{\lambda_v\}_{v \in E^0}$ it is possible to replace it by a family $\lambda' = \{\lambda'_v\}_{v \in E^0}$ such that each λ'_v is a probability measure and for each $v \in E^0$ the measures λ_v and λ'_v are mutually absolutely continuous. However, in practice one does not always want to do this. In particular, when $r^{-1}(v)$ is discrete one often chooses λ_v to be counting measure.

3.1. **The C^*-correspondence associated to a topological quiver.** A topological quiver $\mathcal{Q} = (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ gives rise to a C^*-correspondence in the following manner: We let $A := C_0(E^0)$ and define an A-valued inner product on $C_c(E^1)$ by

$$\langle \xi, \eta \rangle_A(v) := \int_{r^{-1}(v)} \overline{\xi(\alpha)} \eta(\alpha)\, d\lambda_v(\alpha) \qquad \text{for } v \in E^0 \text{ and } \xi, \eta \in C_c(E^1).$$

We shall let X denote the closure of $C_c(E^1)$ in the norm arising from this inner product. We define a right action of A on X by setting

$$\xi \cdot f(\alpha) := \xi(\alpha) f(r(\alpha)) \qquad \text{for } \alpha \in E^1,\ \xi \in C_c(E^1), \text{ and } f \in C_0(E^0)$$

and extending to all of X. We also define a left action $\phi : A \to \mathcal{L}(X)$ by setting

$$\phi(f)\xi(\alpha) := f(s(\alpha))\xi(\alpha) \qquad \text{for } \alpha \in E^1,\ \xi \in C_c(E^1), \text{ and } f \in C_0(E^0)$$

and extending to all of X. With this inner product and these actions X is a C^*-correspondence over A, and we refer to X as the *C^*-correspondence associated to $\mathcal{Q}$.*

Remark 3.2 (The Continuous Field of Hilbert Spaces). If $\mathcal{Q} = (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ is a topological quiver, then the C^*-correspondence associated to $\mathcal{Q}$ naturally gives rise to a continuous field of Hilbert spaces over E^0, and the C^*-correspondence associated to $\mathcal{Q}$ is the continuous sections of this field that vanish at infinity. Let us describe this in more detail. For each $v \in E^0$ we define $H(v) := L^2(r^{-1}(v), \lambda_v)$. We also define a family of sections; i.e., a subset of $\Pi_{v \in E^0} H(v)$, by $\Lambda := \{x_\xi : \xi \in$

$C_c(E^1)\}$ where $x_\xi(v) := \xi|_{r^{-1}(v)}$. Since λ_v is a Radon measure, the compactly supported continuous functions are dense in $L^2(r^{-1}(v), \lambda_v)$. Therefore Λ satisfies (i), (ii), and (iii) of [13, Definition 10.1.2] and by [13, Proposition 10.2.3] we may conclude that there exists a unique subset Γ of $\Pi_{v \in E^0} H(v)$ that contains Λ and satisfies axioms (i) to (iv) of [13, Definition 10.1.2]. Consequently, $\mathcal{H} := (\{H(v)\}_{v \in E^0}, \Gamma)$ is a continuous field of Hilbert spaces. Furthermore, we see that X, the C^*-correspondence associated to $\mathcal{Q}$, may be identified with $C_0(E^0, \mathcal{H}) := \{x \in \Gamma : v \mapsto \|x(v)\| \text{ is in } C_0(E^0)\}$, the continuous sections of $\mathcal{H}$ that vanish at infinity.

In addition, let $\mathcal{K} := (\{K(v)\}_{v \in E^0}, \Theta)$ be the continuous field of elementary C^*-algebras associated to $\mathcal{H}$ as defined in [13, 10.7.2] — we mention, in particular, that $K(v) := \mathcal{K}(L^2(r^{-1}(v), \lambda_v))$ and that for $x, y \in \Gamma$ we define $\Theta_{x,y} \in \Pi_{v \in E^0} K(v)$ by $\Theta_{x,y}(v) := \Theta_{x(v), y(v)}$, and then Θ is obtained by applying [13, Proposition 10.2.3] to the linear span of $\{\Theta_{x,y} : x, y \in \Gamma\}$. Since X is identified with $C_0(E^0, \mathcal{H})$ it follows from the proof of [45, Proposition C1] that $\mathcal{K}(X)$ may be identified with $C_0(E^0, \mathcal{K}) := \{x \in \Theta : v \mapsto \|x(v)\| \text{ is in } C_0(E^0)\}$, and any $T \in \mathcal{K}(X)$ is identified with the element $\tilde{T} \in C_0(E^0, \mathcal{K})$ defined by $\langle \tilde{T}(v)\xi|_{r^{-1}(v)}, \eta|_{r^{-1}(v)} \rangle = \langle T\xi, \eta \rangle_A(v)$ for all $v \in E^0$ and $\xi, \eta \in C_c(E^1)$.

Remark 3.3. We shall often use the following notation when dealing with elements of $C_0(E^0, \mathcal{H})$. If $x \in C_0(E^0, \mathcal{H})$, then for $v \in E^0$ the section x will assign a function $x(v) \in H(v) = L^2(r^{-1}(v), \lambda_v)$ to v. If $\alpha \in r^{-1}(v)$, then the value of this function at α will be denoted by $x(v; \alpha)$. Hence $x(v) = x(v; \cdot) \in L^2(r^{-1}(v), \lambda_v)$.

Remark 3.4. Katsura has shown in [28, §1] that when r is a local homeomorphism the C^*-correspondence X may be identified with

$$C_d(E^1) := \{\varphi \in C_b(E^1) : \langle \varphi, \varphi \rangle_A \in C_0(E^0)\}.$$

However, as we see from Remark 3.2, X will in general be more complicated than this.

Remark 3.5. If $\mathcal{Q}$ is a topological quiver and X is the C^*-correspondence associated to $\mathcal{Q}$, then X is (left) essential; that is, $\phi(A)X = X$. This is because if $\{e_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ is an approximate unit for A, then $\lim_\lambda \phi(e_\lambda)\xi = \xi$ for all $\xi \in C_c(E^1)$, and since $C_c(E^1)$ is dense in X it follows that X is essential.

We now wish to describe the elements in $J(X) := \phi^{-1}(\mathcal{K}(X))$, which we shall ultimately accomplish in Corollary 3.12. Before that, however, we shall need a number of lemmas.

Throughout the following let $\mathcal{Q} = (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ be a topological quiver and let X denote the C^*-correspondence associated to $\mathcal{Q}$.

Lemma 3.6. *Let $\mathcal{Q} = (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ be a topological quiver and let X denote the C^*-correspondence associated to $\mathcal{Q}$. Let $\mathcal{H} := (\{H(v)\}_{v \in E^0}, \Gamma)$ be the continuous field of Hilbert spaces defined by $\mathcal{Q}$ and identify X with $C_0(E^0, \mathcal{H})$ as described in Remark 3.2. Then there exists a $*$-homomorphism $\sigma : C_b(E^1) \to \mathcal{L}(X)$ defined by*

$$(\sigma(\varphi)x)(v; \alpha) := \varphi(\alpha)x(v; \alpha)$$

for $\varphi \in C_b(E^1)$, $x \in C_0(E^0, \mathcal{H})$, $v \in E^0$, and $\alpha \in r^{-1}(v)$.

Proof. The only nontrivial part is to show that if $\varphi \in C_b(E^1)$ and $x \in C_0(E^0, \mathcal{H})$, then $\sigma(\varphi)x$ is a continuous section of $\mathcal{H}$. Since Λ is dense in Γ it suffices to prove this when x is of the form x_ξ for $\xi \in C_c(E^1)$. But $\sigma(\varphi)x_\xi = x_{\varphi\xi}$, so $\sigma(\varphi)x_\xi$ is clearly a continuous section for all $\xi \in C_c(E^1)$. □

Lemma 3.7. *If $\varphi \in C_b(E^1)$ and $\sigma(\varphi) \in \mathcal{K}(X)$, then $\varphi \in C_0(E^1)$.*

Proof. We shall prove the contrapositive. Let $\varphi \in C_b(E^1)$ and suppose that $\varphi \notin C_0(E^1)$. Then there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that $C := \{\alpha \in E^1 : |\varphi(\alpha)| \geq \epsilon\}$ is not compact. Given any $\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_n, \eta_1, \ldots, \eta_n \in C_c(E^1)$ we shall show that

$$\|\sigma(\varphi) - \sum_{k=1}^{n} \Theta_{\xi_k,\eta_k}\| \geq \epsilon/2.$$

Since C is not compact there exists $\alpha_0 \in C$ such that $\alpha_0 \notin \operatorname{supp} \eta_k$ for all $k = 1, \ldots, n$. Since $\bigcup_{k=1}^{n} \operatorname{supp} \eta_k$ is closed and $\{\alpha \in E^1 : |\varphi(\alpha)| > \epsilon/2\}$ is open there exists a neighborhood U_0 of α_0 with $U_0 \subseteq \{\alpha \in E^1 : |\varphi(\alpha)| > \epsilon/2\} \backslash \bigcup_{k=1}^{n} \operatorname{supp} \eta_k$. By Urysohn's Lemma there exists $\zeta \in C_c(U_0)$ with $0 \leq \zeta \leq 1$ and $\zeta(\alpha_0) = 1$. Now for all $k \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ and all $\alpha \in E^1$ we have

$$(\Theta_{\xi_k,\eta_k}\zeta)(\alpha) = (\xi_k \langle \eta_k, \zeta \rangle_A)(\alpha) = \xi_k(\alpha) \int_{r^{-1}(r(\alpha))} \overline{\eta_k(\beta)} \zeta(\beta) \, d\lambda_v(\beta) = 0$$

so that $\Theta_{\xi_k,\eta_k}\zeta = 0$. Furthermore, for all $\alpha \in E^1$ we have $|\varphi(\alpha)\zeta(\alpha)| \geq \epsilon/2 \, |\zeta(\alpha)|$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\|(\sigma(\varphi) - \sum_{k=1}^{n} \Theta_{\xi_k,\eta_k})\zeta\|_A &= \|\sigma(\varphi)\zeta\|_A \\
&= \sup_{v \in E^0} \langle \sigma(\varphi)\zeta, \sigma(\varphi)\zeta \rangle_A^{1/2}(v) \\
&= \sup_{v \in E^0} \left(\int_{r^{-1}(v)} |\sigma(\varphi)\zeta(\alpha)|^2 \, d\lambda_v(\alpha) \right)^{1/2} \\
&\geq \sup_{v \in E^0} \left(\int_{r^{-1}(v)} |\epsilon/2|^2 |\zeta(\alpha)|^2 \, d\lambda_v(\alpha) \right)^{1/2} \\
&= \epsilon/2 \sup_{v \in E^0} \left(\int_{r^{-1}(v)} |\zeta(\alpha)|^2 \, d\lambda_v(\alpha) \right)^{1/2} \\
&= \epsilon/2 \, \|\zeta\|_A
\end{aligned}$$

and consequently $\|\sigma(\varphi) - \sum_{k=1}^{n} \Theta_{\xi_k,\eta_k}\| \geq \epsilon/2$. Since $C_c(E^1)$ is dense in X it follows that $\mathcal{K}(X)$ is equal to the closed linear span of $\{\Theta_{\xi,\eta} : \xi, \eta \in C_c(E^1)\}$, and therefore $\sigma(\varphi) \notin \mathcal{K}(X)$. ☐

Lemma 3.8. *Let $\mathcal{Q} = (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ be a topological quiver, let X denote the C^*-correspondence associated to $\mathcal{Q}$, and let $\sigma : C_b(E^1) \to \mathcal{L}(X)$ be the $*$-homomorphism defined in Lemma 3.6. If $\varphi \in C_b(E^1)$ with $\varphi \geq 0$ and $\sigma(\varphi) \in \mathcal{K}(X)$, then for any $\alpha \in \operatorname{osupp} \varphi$ there exists a neighborhood V of α such that $V \cap r^{-1}(r(\alpha)) = \{\alpha\}$.*

Proof. Given $\alpha \in \operatorname{osupp} \varphi$ let $v := r(\alpha)$. Also let $\sigma_v(\varphi)$ denote the operator on $L^2(r^{-1}(v), \lambda_v)$ given by

$$(\sigma_v(\varphi)\xi)(\beta) := \varphi(\beta)\xi(\beta) \qquad \text{for } \xi \in L^2(r^{-1}(v), \lambda_v) \text{ and } \beta \in r^{-1}(v).$$

Now $\sigma_v(\varphi)$ is clearly a positive normal operator, and by the second paragraph of Remark 3.2 we see that $\sigma_v(\varphi) \in \mathcal{K}(L^2(r^{-1}(v), \lambda_v))$. If $\Lambda(\sigma_v(\varphi))$ denotes the spectrum of $\sigma_v(\varphi)$, then by the Spectral Theorem for compact normal operators, we have that $\Lambda(\sigma_v(\varphi))$ consists of a countable set of values $\lambda_1 > \lambda_2 > \ldots > 0$ which is either discrete or has 0 as its only limit point. Furthermore, since $\operatorname{supp}\lambda_v = r^{-1}(v)$ and φ is continuous, it follows that $\Lambda(\sigma_v(\varphi)) = \varphi(r^{-1}(v))$. Thus

$$\operatorname{im}(\varphi|_{\operatorname{osupp}\varphi \cap r^{-1}(v)}) = \{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \ldots\}\backslash\{0\}$$

is discrete, and for each $\lambda_i \neq 0$ the set $V_i := \{\beta \in r^{-1}(v) : \varphi(\beta) = \lambda_i\}$ is a clopen subset of $r^{-1}(v)$ and $\operatorname{osupp}(\varphi|_{r^{-1}(v)}) = \bigcup_i V_i$. If P_i is the projection onto the eigenspace corresponding to λ_i, then the Spectral Theorem implies that P_i has finite rank and

$$\dim L^2(V_i, \lambda_v|_{V_i}) = \dim P_i(L^2(r^{-1}(v), \lambda_v)) < \infty.$$

But this implies that $\lambda_v|_{V_i}$ is atomic with finitely many atoms. Furthermore, since $\operatorname{supp}\lambda_v = r^{-1}(v)$ the set V_i must be the union of these atoms and consequently V_i contains a finite number of elements. Thus each V_i is discrete and $\operatorname{osupp}\varphi = \bigcup_i V_i$ is discrete in $r^{-1}(v)$. □

Lemma 3.9. *Let $\mathcal{Q} = (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ be a topological quiver, let X denote the C^*-correspondence associated to $\mathcal{Q}$, and let $\sigma : C_b(E^1) \to \mathcal{L}(X)$ be the $*$-homomorphism defined in Lemma 3.6. If $\varphi \in C_b(E^1)$ and $\sigma(\varphi) \in \mathcal{K}(X)$, then for any $\alpha \in \operatorname{osupp}\varphi$ there exists a neighborhood U of α such that $r|_U : U \to r(U)$ is a homeomorphism.*

Proof. We first claim that without loss of generality we may assume that $\varphi \geq 0$. This is because if $\sigma(\varphi) \in \mathcal{K}(X)$, then $\sigma(|\varphi|^2) = \sigma(\varphi)\sigma(\varphi^*) \in \mathcal{K}(X)$ and $\operatorname{osupp}|\varphi|^2 = \operatorname{osupp}\varphi$. So we may replace φ by $|\varphi|^2$.

Furthermore, we may assume that $\sigma(\varphi)$ is in $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{Ped}}(\mathcal{K}(X))$, the Pedersen ideal of $\mathcal{K}(X)$ (see [43, Theorem 5.6.1]). This is because if it were not, then we could choose $g \in C_c((0,\infty))$ with $g(\varphi(\alpha)) \neq 0$, and then $\sigma(g \circ \varphi) = g(\sigma(\varphi)) \in \mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{Ped}}(\mathcal{K}(X))$ and $\alpha \in \operatorname{osupp}(g \circ \varphi)$, so we could replace φ by $g \circ \varphi$.

Now let $k = \varphi(\alpha)/2 > 0$ and set $W := \varphi^{-1}((k,\infty))$. Then W is a neighborhood of α, and by Lemma 3.8 we may choose another neighborhood V of α such that $V \cap r^{-1}(r(\alpha)) = \{\alpha\}$. By the local compactness of E^1 we may choose a precompact neighborhood U' of α with $\overline{U'} \subseteq W \cap V$. By Urysohn's Lemma there exists a function $\xi \in C_c(E^1)$ with $0 \leq \xi \leq k$ and such that $\xi|_{\overline{U'}} \equiv k$ and $\xi|_{E^1\backslash W} \equiv 0$. We furthermore see that $\xi \leq \varphi$.

Since $X = C_0(E^0, \mathcal{K})$ is a continuous-trace C^*-algebra [13, Proposition 10.3.2], it follows that the continuous-trace ideal $\mathfrak{m}(\mathcal{K}(X))$ is dense in $\mathcal{K}(X)$ [13, 4.5.2]. Because the Pedersen ideal is minimal among dense ideals [43, Theorem 5.6.1] it follows that $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{Ped}}(\mathcal{K}(X)) \subseteq \mathfrak{m}(\mathcal{K}(X))$, and hence $\sigma(\varphi) \in \mathfrak{m}(\mathcal{K}(X))$. Since $\sigma(\varphi) \in \mathfrak{m}(\mathcal{K}(X))$ we see that $\sigma(\varphi)$ is a continuous-trace element [13, 4.5.2] and since $\sigma(\xi) \leq \sigma(\varphi)$ it follows from [13, 4.4.2(i)] that $\sigma(\xi)$ is a continuous-trace element.

For each $v \in E^0$ we let $\sigma_v(\xi)$ denote the element of $\mathcal{K}(L^2(r^{-1}(v), \lambda_v))$ given by $(\sigma_v(\xi)\eta)(\beta) := \xi(\beta)\eta(\beta)$ for $\eta \in L^2(r^{-1}(v), \lambda_v)$ and $\beta \in r^{-1}(v)$. Since $\sigma(\xi)$ is a continuous-trace element of $\mathcal{K}(X) = C_0(E^0, \mathcal{K})$, it follows that $v \mapsto \operatorname{tr}(\sigma_v(\xi))$ is a continuous function on E^0. Furthermore, since $\sigma_v(\xi)$ is multiplication by ξ it may be viewed as a diagonal operator with diagonal entries $\{\xi(\beta) : r(\beta) = v\}$, and consequently $\operatorname{tr}(\sigma_v(\xi)) = \sum_{\beta \in r^{-1}(v)} \xi(\beta)$. If we let $v_0 := r(\alpha)$, then since $v_0 \in U' \subseteq V$ we see that $\operatorname{tr}(\sigma_{v_0}(\xi)) = \xi(\alpha) = k$. By the continuity of $v \mapsto \operatorname{tr}(\sigma_v(\xi))$ we may choose a neighborhood Y of v_0 such that $\operatorname{tr}(\sigma_v(\xi)) < 3k/2$ for all $v \in Y$. Define $U := U' \cap r^{-1}(Y)$. Since $\xi|_U \equiv k$ we see that in order for $\operatorname{tr}(\sigma_v(\xi)) = \sum_{\beta \in r^{-1}(v)} \xi(\beta)$ to be less than $3k/2$ we must have $|r^{-1}(v) \cap U| \leq 1$. Thus $r|_U$ is injective. Since $r|_U : U \to r(U)$ is a continuous open map that is injective, it is a homeomorphism. $\square$

Lemma 3.10. *If $\varphi \in C_0(E^1)$, then for every $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $\xi \in C_c(E^1)$ such that $\|\varphi - \xi\| < \epsilon$ and $\operatorname{osupp} \xi \subseteq \operatorname{osupp} \varphi$.*

Proof. Given $\epsilon > 0$ let $K := \{\alpha \in E^1 : |\varphi(\alpha)| \geq \epsilon\}$ and $U := \{\alpha \in E^1 : |\varphi(\alpha)| > \epsilon/2\}$. Choose a continuous function $\eta : E^1 \to [0,1]$ with $\eta|_K \equiv 1$ and $\eta|_{E^1 \setminus U} \equiv 0$. If we let $\xi = \eta\varphi$, then $\operatorname{supp} \xi$ is contained in the compact set $\{\alpha \in E^1 : |\varphi(\alpha)| \geq \epsilon/2\}$ so $\xi \in C_c(E^1)$. Furthermore, $\|\varphi - \xi\| < \epsilon$ and $\operatorname{osupp} \xi \subseteq U \subseteq \operatorname{osupp} \varphi$. $\square$

Theorem 3.11. *Let $\mathcal{Q} = (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ be a topological quiver and let X denote the C^*-correspondence associated to $\mathcal{Q}$. If $\varphi \in C_b(E^1)$, then $\sigma(\varphi) \in \mathcal{K}(X)$ if and only if the following two conditions are satisfied:*

1. *$\varphi \in C_0(E^1)$*
2. *for every $\alpha \in \operatorname{osupp} \varphi$ there exists a neighborhood U of α such that the restriction $r|_U : U \to r(U)$ is a homeomorphism.*

Proof. If $\sigma(\varphi) \in \mathcal{K}(X)$, then we see that (1) holds by Lemma 3.7 and that (2) holds by Lemma 3.9.

Conversely, suppose that (1) and (2) hold. Let $\epsilon > 0$. Then by Lemma 3.10 there exists $\xi \in C_c(E^1)$ such that $\|\varphi - \xi\| < \epsilon$ and $\operatorname{osupp} \xi \subseteq \operatorname{osupp} \varphi$. If we let $K := \operatorname{supp} \xi$, then K is a compact subset of E^1 contained in $\operatorname{osupp} \varphi$. Thus for every $\alpha \in K$ there exists a neighborhood U_α of α for which $r|_{U_\alpha} : U_\alpha \to r(U_\alpha)$ is a homeomorphism. Using the compactness of K we may choose a finite number of edges $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n \in K$ such that $K \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^n U_\alpha$. Since E^1 is locally compact there exists a partition of unity on K subordinate to $\{U_{\alpha_i}\}_{i=1}^n$ consisting of compactly supported functions $\{\zeta_i\}_{i=1}^n$; in particular this means that $0 \leq \zeta_i \leq 1$ for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ and $\sum_{i=1}^n \zeta_i(\alpha) = 1$ for all $\alpha \in K$. Now for each $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ we define $\xi_i := \xi \zeta_i^{1/2}$.

Furthermore, for each i choose a function $\kappa_i \in C_c(E^1)$ such that $0 \leq \kappa_i \leq 1$ and $\kappa_i|_{\operatorname{supp} \zeta_i} \equiv 1$. Since the map $v \mapsto \int_{r^{-1}(v)} \kappa_i(\beta)\, d\lambda_v(\beta)$ is in $C_c(E^0)$, and since r is continuous, it follows that the map $\alpha \mapsto \int_{r^{-1}(r(\alpha))} \kappa_i(\beta)\, d\lambda_{r(\alpha)}(\beta)$ is a continuous real-valued function on E^1. Because $\operatorname{supp} \xi_i$ is compact we know that this function attains a minimum on $\operatorname{supp} \xi_i$. In addition, since $r|_{U_{\alpha_i}}$ is a homeomorphism we see that for every $\alpha \in \operatorname{supp} \xi_i$ we have that $\int_{r^{-1}(r(\alpha))} \kappa_i(\beta)\, d\lambda_{r(\alpha)} = \lambda_{r(\alpha)}(\{\alpha\})$ and since $\operatorname{supp} \lambda_v = r^{-1}(v)$ it follows that $\lambda_{r(\alpha)}(\{\alpha\}) \neq 0$. Thus $\{\lambda_{r(\alpha)}(\{\alpha\}) : \alpha \in \operatorname{supp} \xi_i\}$ is bounded below by a nonzero constant. Consequently, the function

$$\alpha \mapsto \frac{\zeta_i^{1/2}(\alpha)}{\lambda_{r(\alpha)}(\{\alpha\})} = \zeta_i^{1/2}(\alpha)(\lambda_{r(\alpha)}(\{\alpha\}))^{-1}$$

is a continuous function on E^1. Furthermore, since the denominator in the above quotient is bounded below by a nonzero constant, if we define $\eta_i : E^1 \to \mathbb{C}$ by $\eta_i(\alpha) := \zeta_i^{1/2}(\alpha)(\lambda_{r(\alpha)}(\{\alpha\}))^{-1}$, then we have that $\eta_i \in C_c(E^1)$ and $\operatorname{supp} \eta_i = \operatorname{supp} \zeta_i \subseteq U_{\alpha_i}$.

For each i, we may use the fact that $r|_{U_{\alpha_i}}$ is a homeomorphism, the fact that $\operatorname{supp} \xi_i \subseteq U_{\alpha_i}$, and the fact that $\operatorname{supp} \eta_i \subseteq U_{\alpha_i}$ to conclude that

$$\xi_i(\alpha) \int_{r^{-1}(r(\alpha))} \overline{\eta_i(\beta)} \vartheta(\beta)\, d\lambda_{r(\alpha)}(\beta) = \xi_i(\alpha)\eta_i(\alpha)\vartheta(\alpha)\lambda_{r(\alpha)}(\{\alpha\})$$

$$= \xi_i(\alpha)\zeta_i^{1/2}(\alpha)\vartheta(\alpha)$$

for all $\alpha \in E^1$ and $\vartheta \in C_c(E^1)$. Using this equation we see that for any $\vartheta \in C_c(E^1)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}(\sigma(\xi)x_\vartheta)(v;\alpha) = \xi(\alpha)\vartheta(\alpha) &= \sum_{i=1}^n \xi(\alpha)\zeta_i(\alpha)\vartheta(\alpha) = \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i(\alpha)\zeta_i^{1/2}(\alpha)\vartheta(\alpha)\\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i(\alpha)\int_{r^{-1}(r(\alpha))} \overline{\eta_i(\beta)}\vartheta(\beta)\, d\lambda_{r(\alpha)}(\beta)\\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i(\alpha)\langle \eta_i, \vartheta\rangle_A(r(\alpha)) = \sum_{i=1}^n (\Theta_{\xi_i,\eta_i}\vartheta)(\alpha).\end{aligned}$$

Because the sections $\{x_\vartheta : \vartheta \in C_c(E^1)\}$ are dense in X this implies that $\sigma(\xi) = \sum_{i=1}^n \Theta_{\xi_i,\eta_i} \in \mathcal{K}(X)$. But then

$$\|\sigma(\varphi) - \sigma(\xi)\| = \|\sigma(\varphi - \xi)\| \leq \|\varphi - \xi\| < \epsilon$$

and consequently $\sigma(\varphi) \in \mathcal{K}(X)$. □

Corollary 3.12. *Let $\mathcal{Q} = (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ be a topological quiver and let X denote the C^*-correspondence associated to $\mathcal{Q}$. If $f \in C_0(E^0)$, then $\phi(f) \in \mathcal{K}(X)$ if and only if the following two conditions are satisfied:*

1. $f \circ s \in C_0(E^1)$
2. *for every $\alpha \in \operatorname{osupp}(f \circ s)$ there exists a neighborhood U of α such that the restriction $r|_U : U \to r(U)$ is a homeomorphism.*

Proof. This follows from the fact that $f \in C_0(E^0)$ implies $f \circ s \in C_b(E^1)$ and the fact that $\phi(f) = \sigma(f \circ s)$. □

Remark 3.13. If we consider the map $\sigma : C_b(E^1) \to \mathcal{L}(X)$ defined in Lemma 3.6, then Theorem 3.11 can be used to show that $\sigma^{-1}(\mathcal{K}(X)) = C_0(U)$ where U is the largest open subset of E^1 with the property that $r|_U$ is a local homeomorphism and $s|_U$ is a proper map.

3.2. Special Sets of Vertices.

Since $A := C_0(E^0)$ is a commutative C^*-algebra, it follows that the ideals of A correspond to open subsets of E^0 in the following way: Whenever I is an ideal in $C_0(E^0)$ we define a closed set $C := \{v \in E^0 : f(v) = 0 \text{ for all } f \in I\}$ and an open set $U := E^0 \backslash C$, and then

$$I = \{f \in C_0(E^0) : f|_C \equiv 0\} \cong C_0(U).$$

Using this fact, we define the following subsets of E^0.

Definition 3.14. Let $\mathcal{Q} = (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ be a topological quiver and let X be the C^*-correspondence over $A := C_0(E^0)$ associated to $\mathcal{Q}$.

1. We define E^0_{sinks} to be the open subset of E^0 for which $\phi^{-1}(0) = C_0(E^0_{\text{sinks}})$, and we call the elements of E^0_{sinks} the *sinks* of $\mathcal{Q}$.
2. We define E^0_{fin} to be the open subset of E^0 for which $\phi^{-1}(\mathcal{K}(X)) = C_0(E^0_{\text{fin}})$, and we call the elements of E^0_{fin} the *finite emitters* of $\mathcal{Q}$. Vertices which are not finite emitters shall be known as *infinite emitters*.
3. We define the *regular vertices* of $\mathcal{Q}$ to be the elements of the open set $E^0_{\text{reg}} := E^0_{\text{fin}} \backslash \overline{E^0_{\text{sinks}}}$. Vertices which are not regular vertices shall be known as *singular vertices*.

Note that $\ker\phi = C_0(E^0_{\text{sinks}})$, $J(X) = C_0(E^0_{\text{fin}})$, and $J_X = C_0(E^0_{\text{reg}})$. We also have the following characterizations of these sets.

Proposition 3.15. *If $\mathcal{Q} = (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ is a topological quiver, then the following equalities hold:*

1. $E^0_{\text{sinks}} = E^0 \backslash \overline{s(E^1)}$
2. $E^0_{\text{fin}} = \{v \in E^0$: *there exists a precompact neighborhood V of v such that $s^{-1}(\overline{V})$ is compact and $r|_{s^{-1}(V)}$ is a local homeomorphism*$\}$
3. $E^0_{\text{reg}} = \{v \in E^0$: *there exists a precompact neighborhood V of v such that $s^{-1}(\overline{V})$ is compact and $r|_{s^{-1}(V)}$ is a local homeomorphism* $\} \cap \operatorname{Int}\overline{s(E^1)}$, *where* $\operatorname{Int}\overline{s(E^1)}$ *denotes the interior of* $\overline{s(E^1)}$.

Proof. To see (1), let $C := \{v \in E^0 : f(v) = 0 \text{ for all } f \in \phi^{-1}(0)\}$. It then suffices to show that $C = \overline{s(E^1)}$. If $v \in \overline{s(E^1)}$ then there exists a sequence of edges $\{\alpha_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ such that $\lim_{n\to\infty} s(\alpha_n) = v$. By Urysohn's Lemma, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a function $\xi_n \in C_c(E^1)$ such that $\xi_n(\alpha_n) \neq 0$. But then for any $f \in \phi^{-1}(0)$ we have that $\phi(f)\xi_n = 0$ and hence $f(s(\alpha_n))\xi_n(\alpha_n) = \phi(f)\xi_n(\alpha_n) = 0$. Since $\xi_n(\alpha_n) \neq 0$ this implies that $f(s(\alpha_n)) = 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Taking limits as n goes to infinity gives that $f(v) = 0$, and since f was an arbitrary element of $\phi^{-1}(0)$ this shows that $v \in C$ and $\overline{s(E^1)} \subseteq C$.

Conversely, suppose $v \notin \overline{s(E^1)}$. Then there exists a neighborhood U of v such that $U \cap s(E^1) = \emptyset$. Using Urysohn's Lemma there exists a continuous compactly supported function $f : E^0 \to \mathbb{C}$ with $f(v) = 1$ and $\operatorname{supp} f \subseteq U$. But then $\operatorname{supp} f \cap s(E^1) = \emptyset$ and $f(s(\alpha)) = 0$ for all $\alpha \in E^1$. Consequently, for any $\xi \in C_c(E^1)$ we have

$$\phi(f)\xi(\alpha) = f(s(\alpha))\xi(\alpha) = 0 \qquad \text{for all } \alpha \in E^1$$

so that $\phi(f)\xi = 0$. Since ξ was an arbitrary function in $C_c(E^1)$ this implies that $\phi(f) = 0$, and since $f(v) \neq 0$ we have that $v \notin C$. Thus $C \subseteq \overline{s(E^1)}$.

To see the equality stated in (2) let U denote the right hand side of the equality and let $C := \{v \in E^0 : f(v) = 0 \text{ for all } f \in \phi^{-1}(\mathcal{K}(X))\}$. It then suffices to show that $U = E^0 \backslash C$. Let $v \in U$. Then there exists a precompact neighborhood V of v such that $s^{-1}(\overline{V})$ is compact and $r|_{s^{-1}(V)}$ is a local homeomorphism. Using Urysohn's Lemma choose $f \in C_0(E^0)$ with $f(v) = 1$ and $\operatorname{supp} f \subseteq V$. Then $\operatorname{supp}(f \circ s) \subseteq s^{-1}(V)$ is compact and we see that Conditions (1) and (2) of Corollary 3.12 are satisfied so that $\phi(f) \in \mathcal{K}(X)$. Since $f(v) \neq 0$ this implies that $v \notin C$ and consequently $U \subseteq E^0 \backslash C$.

To see the converse, suppose that $v \in E^0 \backslash C$. Then there exists $f \in \phi^{-1}(\mathcal{K}(X))$ such that $f(v) \neq 0$. Let $\epsilon := |f(v)|/2$ and $V := \{w \in E^0 : |f(w)| > \epsilon\}$. Then V is a neighborhood of v which is precompact since $f \in C_0(E^0)$ and $\overline{V} = \{w \in E^0 : |f(w)| \geq \epsilon\}$. Furthermore, since $\phi(f) \in \mathcal{K}(X)$ it follows from Condition (1) of Corollary 3.12 that $f \circ s \in C_0(E^1)$, and consequently $s^{-1}(\overline{V}) \subseteq \{\alpha \in E^1 : |f \circ s| \geq \epsilon\}$ is compact. Furthermore, since $s^{-1}(\overline{V}) \subseteq \operatorname{osupp}(f \circ s)$ it follows from Condition (2) of Corollary 3.12 that $r|_{s^{-1}(V)}$ is a local homeomorphism. Thus $v \in U$ and $E^0 \backslash C \subseteq U$.

The equality stated in (3) follows from the equalities in (1) and (2). $\square$

Remark 3.16. The terminology of Definition 3.14 is meant to generalize the various types of vertices found in directed graphs. Note that when $\mathcal{Q}$ is a directed graph (i.e., when E^0 and E^1 have the discrete topology) the sinks of $\mathcal{Q}$ are the vertices that emit no edges, the finite emitters of $\mathcal{Q}$ are the vertices that emit a finite number of edges, and the regular vertices of $\mathcal{Q}$ are the vertices that emit a finite and nonzero number of edges. These particular classes of vertices play an important role in the analysis of graph C^*-algebras (cf. [5, 46, 4, 14]) and as we shall see, their generaliztions play an equally important role in the analysis of C^*-algebras associated to topological quivers.

3.3. The C^*-algebra associated to a topological quiver.

Definition 3.17 (The C^*-algebra associated to a Topological Quiver). Suppose that $\mathcal{Q} = (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ is a topological quiver, and let X denote the C^*-correspondence over $A := C_0(E^0)$ determined by $\mathcal{Q}$. We let $(\psi_{\mathcal{Q}}, \pi_{\mathcal{Q}})$ denote a universal Toeplitz representation of X which is coisometric on $C_0(E^0_{\text{reg}})$. We also define $C^*(\mathcal{Q})$, *the C^*-algebra associated to* $\mathcal{Q}$, to be the relative Cuntz-Pimsner algebra $C^*(\psi_{\mathcal{Q}}, \pi_{\mathcal{Q}}) = \mathcal{O}(C_0(E^0_{\text{reg}}), X)$.

Remark 3.18. We see from Definition 3.14 that $J_X = C_0(E^0_{\text{reg}})$ so that $C^*(\mathcal{Q})$ is equal to $\mathcal{O}_X := \mathcal{O}(J_X, X)$. Furthermore, if $\mathcal{Q}$ has no sinks, then $\ker\phi = \{0\}$ and $C^*(\mathcal{Q}) = \mathcal{O}(C_0(E^0_{\text{fin}}), X) = \mathcal{O}(J(X), X)$ is equal to the augmented C^*-algebra of X as defined by Pimsner in [44, Remark 1.2(3)].

Example 3.19 (Graph C^*-algebras). Let $E := (E^0, E^1, r, s)$ be a directed graph, and let $C^*(E)$ be the graph algebra defined in [34, 35, 5, 18, 4]. We endow E^0 and E^1 with the discrete topologies so that r and s are continuous open maps. Also, we define $\lambda = \{\lambda_v\}_{v\in E^0}$ where each λ_v is counting measure on $r^{-1}(v)$. Then $\mathcal{Q} := (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ is a topological quiver and the C^*-correspondence X associated to $\mathcal{Q}$ is equal to the graph C^*-correspondence $X(E)$ defined in [20, Example 1.2]. It was shown in [18, Proposition 12] that when E has no sinks $C^*(E) \cong \mathcal{O}(J(X(E)), X(E))$, and as described in [41, §3] this same analysis can be used to show that in general $C^*(E) \cong \mathcal{O}(C_0(E^0_{\text{reg}}), X(E))$. Thus $C^*(\mathcal{Q}) \cong C^*(E)$, and all graph algebras arise as quiver algebras.

Example 3.20 (C^*-algebras of Topological Graphs). Let $E := (E^0, E^1, r, d)$ be a topological graph as defined by Katsura in [28] (so, in particular, E^0 and E^1 are topological spaces, $r : E^1 \to E^0$ is a continuous map, and $d : E^1 \to E^0$ is a local homeomorphism). Then for every v we see that $d^{-1}(v)$ is a discrete space and we may define $\lambda = \{\lambda_v\}_{v\in E^0}$ where each λ_v is counting measure on $d^{-1}(v)$. After interchanging the roles of r and d, we see that $\mathcal{Q} := (E^0, E^1, d, r, \lambda)$ is a topological quiver, and it follows from [28, Definition 2.9] and [28, Definition 2.10] that $C^*(\mathcal{Q})$ is isomorphic to the topological graph algebra $\mathcal{O}(E)$. Thus all topological graph algebras are quiver algebras.

Example 3.21 (C^*-algebras of Branched Coverings). The notion of a branched covering derives from the theory of Riemann surfaces. A general topological definition that goes well beyond the Riemann surface situation was formulated by Fox [21] as follows. Given two second countable locally compact Hausdorff spaces X and X', and a continuous surjection $\sigma : X \to X'$, one says that σ is a branched covering of X' with branching sets $S \subseteq X$ and $S' \subseteq X'$ when the following conditions hold:

1. S and S' are closed with dense complements U and U', respectively,
2. the components of the preimages under σ of open sets of X' are a basis for the topology of X — so that, in particular, σ is an open map,

(3) $\sigma(S) = S'$, $\sigma(U) = U'$, and
(4) $\sigma|_U$ is a local homeomorphism.

Fox assumed that U and U' are connected and that S and S' have co-dimension 2. However, these conditions are superfluous for our purposes.

Examples of branched coverings include the tent map on the unit interval (provided the range of the map is $[0,1]$), orbifold projections, branched coverings from one and several complex variables, and numerous other examples.

Since a branched covering σ is an open map, there is a σ-system $\{\lambda_x\}_{x\in X'}$. When S and S' are discrete, then each λ_x must be atomic. However, in order to be continuous, the atoms may not all have the same weight. In particular, they may not all be point masses. This is the case for rational maps of the sphere and Kajiwara and Watatani [27] have made explicit calculations of $\{\lambda_x\}_{x\in X'}$ in this setting.

If one restricts to the case when $X = X'$, and if one forms the topological quiver $\mathcal{Q} = (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$, where $X = E^0 = E^1$, $s = id$, $r = \sigma$, and λ is a σ-system, one recaptures the initial setting of [12]. However, the authors quickly restricted to the case when $E^1 = U$ and r, s, and λ are restricted to U. That is, the C^*-algebras of [12] are the quiver algebras for quivers obtained from branched coverings after excising the branch points. The algebras studied by Kajiwara and Watatani are formed from branched coverings without excising the branch points.

Example 3.22 (C^*-algebras associated with Topological Relations). Let X be a topological space, and let α be a closed subset of $X \times X$. Also let $\pi_1 : X \times X \to X$ and $\pi_2 : X \times X \to X$ be projection onto the first and second components, respectively. Let $M(X)_+$ denote the positive regular Borel measures on X, and let $\mu : X \to M(X)_+$ be a positive w^*-continuous homomorphism with the property that $\operatorname{supp} \mu_x = \pi_2^{-1}(x)$ for all $x \in X$. In [7] Brenken described how to associate a C^*-algebra $C^*(\alpha)$ to a closed relation α and associated map μ.

Given such an α and μ we may define a quiver $\mathcal{Q} := (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ by setting $E^0 := X$, $E^1 := \alpha$, $r := \pi_1|_\alpha$, $s := \pi_2|_\alpha$, and $\lambda_v := \mu(v)$. One can then see from the definition of $C^*(\alpha)$ in [7, §2] that $C^*(\alpha)$ is isomorphic to $C^*(\mathcal{Q})$. Hence C^*-algebras associated with topological relations arise as quiver algebras.

Example 3.23. If $E = (E^0, E^1, r, s)$ is a directed graph, and X is a locally compact Hausdorff space, then we may form a topological quiver $E \times X$ in the following manner. We first define

$$(E \times X)^0 := E^0 \times X \qquad \text{and} \qquad (E \times X)^1 = E^1 \times X$$

with the product topologies. Next we define $\tilde{r}, \tilde{s} : (E \times X)^1 \to (E \times X)^0$ by

$$\tilde{r}(e,x) = (r(e), x) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \tilde{s}(e,x) = (s(e), x).$$

Finally, for any $(v,x) \in (E \times X)^0$ we define $\lambda_{(v,x)}$ to be counting measure on the countable set $\tilde{r}^{-1}(v,x)$. One can easily verify that $E \times X$ is a topological quiver. In fact, $\tilde{r}$ is a local homeomorphism so that $E \times X$ is a topological graph in the sense of Katsura [28].

Remark 3.24. If $E \times X$ is a topological quiver as defined in Example 3.23, then one can easily show that $(E \times X)^0_{\text{reg}} = E^0_{\text{reg}} \times X$. Furthermore, one can prove that $C^*(E \times X) \cong C^*(E) \otimes C_0(X)$ as follows: Let $\{s_e, p_v\}$ be a generating Cuntz-Krieger family for $C^*(G)$. Then any element of $C_c((E \times X)^1)$ is of the form $\oplus_{e\in F} \xi_e$, where

F is a finite subset of E^1 and each $\xi_e \in C_c(E^1)$. If we define $\psi : C_c((E \times X)^1) \to C^*(E) \otimes C_0(X)$ by $\psi(\oplus_{e \in F} \xi_e) = \sum_{e \in F} s_e \otimes \xi_e$, then we see that ψ is a linear map of norm 1. Since $X = \overline{C_c((E \times X)^1)}^{\|\cdot\|}$ it follows that ψ may be extended to a linear map $\psi : X \to C^*(E) \otimes C_0(E)$. Likewise, since any element of $C_c((E \times X)^0)$ has the form $\oplus_{v \in S} f_v$ where S is a finite subset of E^0 and each $f_v \in C_c(E^0)$, we may define a homomorphism $\pi : C_c((E \times X)^0) \to C^*(E) \otimes C_0(X)$ by $\pi(\oplus_{v \in S} f_v) = \sum_{v \in S} p_v \otimes f_v$, and because $C_c((E \times X)^0)$ is dense in $C_0((E \times X)^0)$ we may extend this to a homomorphism $\pi : C_0((E \times X)^0) \to C^*(E^0) \otimes C_0(X)$. One can then verify that (ψ, π) is a Toeplitz representation which is coisometric on $C_0((E \times X)^0_{\text{reg}})$, and hence induces a homomorphism $\rho_{(\psi,\pi)} : C^*(\mathcal{Q}) \to C^*(E) \otimes C_0(X)$. This homomorphism is clearly surjective since $\{s_e, p_v\}$ generates $C^*(E)$, and it is injective due to the Gauge-Invariant Uniqueness Theorem (see Theorem 4.7 or [41, Theorem 5.3]).

4. ADDING TAILS TO TOPOLOGICAL QUIVERS

If E is a graph and v_0 is a vertex of E, then by *adding a tail to* v_0 we mean attaching a graph of the form

$$v_0 \xrightarrow{e_1} v_1 \xrightarrow{e_2} v_2 \xrightarrow{e_3} v_3 \xrightarrow{e_4} \cdots$$

to E. It was shown in [5, §1] that if F is the graph formed by adding a tail to every sink of E, then F is a graph with no sinks and $C^*(E)$ is canonically isomorphic to a full corner of $C^*(F)$. The technique of adding tails to sinks is a simple but powerful tool in the analysis of graph algebras. In the proofs of many results it allows one to reduce to the case in which the graph has no sinks and thereby avoid certain complications and technicalities.

In this section we describe a process of "adding tails to sinks" for topological quivers and show that if $\mathcal{Q}'$ is formed by adding tails to the sinks of $\mathcal{Q}$, then $C^*(\mathcal{Q})$ is canonically isomorphic to a full corner of $C^*(\mathcal{Q}')$. As with graph algebras, this process will simplify many of our proofs by allowing us to reduce to the "sinkless" case. Adding tails to topological quivers is a fairly straightforward generalization of what occurs in the graph setting, and consequently if the reader keeps the graph situation in mind throughout this section, it will provide substantial motivation for the constructions we introduce.

Definition 4.1. Let $\mathcal{Q} = (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ be a topological quiver. By *adding tails to the sinks of* $\mathcal{Q}$ we mean forming a topological quiver $\mathcal{Q}' = (F^0, F^1, r', s', \lambda')$ in the following manner: Let $V_0 := E^0_{\text{sinks}} \subseteq E^0$ and define $V_i = V_0$ for $i = 1, 2, \ldots$. We then set

$$F^0 := E^0 \sqcup \bigsqcup_{i=1}^{\infty} V_i \qquad\qquad F^1 := E^1 \sqcup \bigsqcup_{i=1}^{\infty} V_i$$

and define $r', s' : F^1 \to F^0$ by

$$r'(\alpha) := \begin{cases} r(\alpha) \in E^0 & \text{if } \alpha \in E^1 \\ v \in V_i & \text{if } \alpha = v \in V_i \end{cases} \qquad s'(\alpha) := \begin{cases} s(\alpha) \in E^0 & \text{if } \alpha \in E^1 \\ v \in V_{i-1} & \text{if } \alpha = v \in V_i \end{cases}$$

and define a family of measures $\lambda' = \{\lambda'_v\}_{v \in F^0}$ by $\lambda'_v = \lambda_v$ if $v \in E^0$ and λ'_v equals counting measure on the singleton $\{v\}$ whenever $v \in V_i$ for some $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots\}$.

Remark 4.2. Let X be the C^*-correspondence over $A := C_0(E^0)$ associated to $\mathcal{Q}$ and let $\phi_A := \phi$ denote the left action. We define $T := \bigoplus_{i=1}^{\infty} C_0(V_i)$ to be the C_0

direct sum of the $C_0(V_i)$'s, and we denote a typical element of T as $\vec{f} = (f_1, f_2, \ldots)$ where each $f_i \in C_0(V_i)$. If $\mathcal{Q}'$ is formed by adding tails to the sinks of $\mathcal{Q}$, and Y denotes the Hilbert C^*-correspondence over $B := C_0(F^0)$ associated to $\mathcal{Q}'$, then we see that Y admits the following description:

$$Y = X \oplus T \qquad \text{and} \qquad B = A \oplus T$$

with right action

$$(\xi, (f_1, f_2, \ldots)) \cdot (a, (g_1, g_2, \ldots)) = (\xi \cdot a, (f_1 g_1, f_2, g_2, \ldots)),$$

inner product

$$\langle (\xi, (f_1, f_2, \ldots)), (\eta, (g_1, g_2, \ldots)) \rangle_B = (\langle \xi, \eta \rangle_A, (f_1^* g_1, f_2^* g_2, \ldots)),$$

and left action

$$\phi_B(a, (g_1, g_2, \ldots))(\xi, (g_1, g_2, \ldots)) = (\phi_A(a)\xi, (a g_1, f_1 g_2, f_2 g_3, \ldots).$$

Since $\ker \phi = C_0(E^0_{\text{sinks}})$ the above shows that Y is the C^*-correspondence formed by adding the tail determined by $\ker \phi$ to the C^*-correspondence X as defined in [41, Definition 4.1]. Thus we have the following interpretation of [41, Theorem 3.1] in the context of topological quivers:

Theorem 4.3 ([41, Theorem 3.1])**.** *Let $\mathcal{Q} = (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ be a topological quiver and let $\mathcal{Q}' = (F^0, F^1, r', s', \lambda')$ be the topological quiver formed by adding tails to the sinks of $\mathcal{Q}$. Let X be the C^*-correspondence over $A = C_0(E^0)$ associated to A, and let $Y = X \oplus T$ be the C^*-correspondence over $B = A \oplus T$ associated to $\mathcal{Q}'$ as described in Remark 4.2.*

(a) *If (ψ, π) is a Toeplitz representation of X on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_\mathcal{Q}$ which is coisometric on $C_0(E^0_{\text{reg}})$, then there is a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{Q}'} = \mathcal{H}_\mathcal{Q} \oplus \mathcal{H}_T$ and a Toeplitz representation $(\tilde{\psi}, \tilde{\pi})$ of Y on $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{Q}'}$ which is coisometric on $C_0(F^0_{\text{reg}})$ and with the property that $\tilde{\psi}|_X = \psi$ and $\tilde{\pi}|_A = \pi$.*

(b) *If $(\tilde{\psi}, \tilde{\pi})$ is a Toeplitz representation of Y in a C^*-algebra C which is coisometric on $C_0(F^0_{\text{reg}})$, then $(\tilde{\psi}|_X, \tilde{\pi}|_A)$ is a Toeplitz representation of X in C which is coisometric on $C_0(E^0_{\text{reg}})$. Furthermore, if $\tilde{\pi}|_A$ is injective, then $\tilde{\pi}$ is injective.*

(c) *Let $(\psi_{\mathcal{Q}'}, \pi_{\mathcal{Q}'})$ be a universal Toeplitz representation of Y in $C^*(\mathcal{Q}')$ which is coisometric on $C_0(F^0_{\text{reg}})$. Then $(\psi, \pi) = (\psi_{\mathcal{Q}'}|_X, \pi_{\mathcal{Q}'}|_A)$ is a Toeplitz representation of X in $C^*(\mathcal{Q}')$ which is coisometric on $C_0(E^0_{\text{reg}})$. Furthermore, the induced homomorphism $\rho_{(\psi,\pi)} : C^*(\mathcal{Q}) \to C^*(\mathcal{Q}')$ is an isomorphism onto the C^*-subalgebra of $C^*(\mathcal{Q}')$ generated by $\{\psi_{\mathcal{Q}'}(\xi, \vec{0}), \pi_{\mathcal{Q}'}(a, \vec{0}) : \xi \in X \text{ and } a \in A\}$, and this C^*-subalgebra is equal to the full corner determined by the projection $p = \lim_\lambda \pi_{\mathcal{Q}'}(e_\lambda, \vec{0}) \in \mathcal{M}(C^*(\mathcal{Q}'))$, where $\{e_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ is an approximate unit for A.*

Corollary 4.4. *If $\mathcal{Q} = (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ is a topological quiver and $\mathcal{Q}' = (F^0, F^1, r', s', \lambda')$ is the topological quiver formed by adding tails to the sinks of $\mathcal{Q}$, then $C^*(\mathcal{Q})$ is canonically isomorphic to a full corner of $C^*(\mathcal{Q}')$.*

Corollary 4.5. *Let $\mathcal{Q} = (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ be a topological quiver and let X be the C^*-correspondence associated to $\mathcal{Q}$. If $(\psi_\mathcal{Q}, \pi_\mathcal{Q})$ is a universal Toeplitz representation of X in $C^*(\mathcal{Q})$ which is coisometric on $C_0(E^0_{\text{reg}})$, then $(\psi_\mathcal{Q}, \pi_\mathcal{Q})$ is injective.*

Proof. By Theorem 4.3(c) we may identify $(C^*(\mathcal{Q}), \psi_{\mathcal{Q}}, \pi_{\mathcal{Q}})$ with $(S, \psi_{\mathcal{Q}'}|_X, \pi_{\mathcal{Q}'}|_A)$, where S is the subalgebra of $C^*(\mathcal{Q}')$ generated by $\{\psi_{\mathcal{Q}'}(\xi, \vec{0}), \pi_{\mathcal{Q}'}(a, \vec{0}) : \xi \in X, a \in A\}$. Since $\mathcal{Q}'$ has no sinks, it follows that ϕ_B is injective and hence [19, Corollary 6.2] implies that $\pi_{\mathcal{Q}'}$ is injective. Consequently $\pi_{\mathcal{Q}'}|_A = \pi_{\mathcal{Q}}$ is injective. □

Corollary 4.6. *Let $\mathcal{Q} = (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ be a topological quiver and let X be the C^*-correspondence associated to $\mathcal{Q}$. If V is an open subset of E^0_{reg} and (ψ, π) is a universal Toeplitz representation of X in $\mathcal{O}(C_0(V), X)$ which is coisometric on $C_0(V)$, then (ψ, π) is injective.*

Proof. Let $(\psi_{\mathcal{Q}}, \pi_{\mathcal{Q}})$ be a universal Toeplitz representation of X in $C^*(\mathcal{Q})$ which is coisometric on $C_0(E^0_{\text{reg}})$. Since $(\psi_{\mathcal{Q}}, \pi_{\mathcal{Q}})$ is coisometric on $C_0(V)$ it induces a homomorphism $\rho_{(\psi_{\mathcal{Q}}, \pi_{\mathcal{Q}})} : \mathcal{O}(C_0(V), X) \to C^*(\mathcal{Q})$ with $\rho_{(\psi_{\mathcal{Q}}, \pi_{\mathcal{Q}})} \circ \pi = \pi_{\mathcal{Q}}$. Because $\pi_{\mathcal{Q}}$ is injective by Corollary 4.5, it follows that π is injective. □

4.1. A Gauge-Invariant Uniqueness Theorem for C^*-algebras associated to Topological Quivers.

In [41, Theorem 5.3] the technique of adding tails to C^*-correspondences was used to prove a gauge-invariant uniqueness theorem for C^*-algebras associated to C^*-correspondences. We shall conclude this section by rephrasing this theorem in the context of topological quivers.

Let $\mathcal{Q} = (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ be a topological quiver and let X be the C^*-correspondence over $A := C_0(E^0)$ associated to $\mathcal{Q}$. If $(\psi_{\mathcal{Q}}, \pi_{\mathcal{Q}})$ is a Toeplitz representation of X which is coisometric on $C_0(E^0_{\text{reg}})$, then for any $z \in \mathbb{T}$ we see that $(z\psi_{\mathcal{Q}}, \pi_{\mathcal{Q}})$ is a Toeplitz representation which is coisometric on $C_0(E^0_{\text{reg}})$. By the universal property of $C^*(\mathcal{Q})$ we obtain a homomorphism $\gamma_z : C^*(\mathcal{Q}) \to C^*(\mathcal{Q})$ such that $\gamma_z(\psi_{\mathcal{Q}}(x)) = z\psi_{\mathcal{Q}}(x)$ for all $x \in X$ and $\gamma_z(\pi_{\mathcal{Q}}(a)) = \pi_{\mathcal{Q}}(a)$ for all $a \in A$. Furthermore, since $\gamma_{z^{-1}}$ is an inverse for γ_z, we see that γ_z is an isomorphism. Thus we have an action $\gamma : \mathbb{T} \to \text{Aut}(C^*(\mathcal{Q}))$, and a routine $\epsilon/3$ argument shows that γ is strongly continuous. We call γ the *gauge action* on $C^*(\mathcal{Q})$.

Because $\mathbb{T}$ is compact, averaging over γ with respect to normalized Haar measure gives an expectation E of $C^*(\mathcal{Q})$ onto the fixed point algebra $C^*(\mathcal{Q})^\gamma$ by

$$E(x) := \int_{\mathbb{T}} \gamma_z(x) dz \qquad \text{for } x \in C^*(\mathcal{Q}).$$

The map E is positive, has norm 1, and is faithful in the sense that $E(a^*a) = 0$ implies $a = 0$.

Theorem 4.7 ([41, Theorem 5.3]). *Let $\mathcal{Q} = (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ be a topological quiver and let X be the C^*-correspondence over $A := C_0(E^0)$ associated to $\mathcal{Q}$. If $(\psi_{\mathcal{Q}}, \pi_{\mathcal{Q}})$ is a universal Toeplitz representation of X into $C^*(\mathcal{Q})$ which is coisometric on $C_0(E^0_{\text{reg}})$, and if $\rho : C^*(\mathcal{Q}) \to C$ is a $*$-homomorphism between C^*-algebras which satisfies*

1. *the restriction of ρ to $\pi_{\mathcal{Q}}(A)$ is injective*
2. *there exists a strongly continuous gauge action $\beta : \mathbb{T} \to \text{Aut}(\text{im}\,\rho)$ such that $\beta_z \circ \rho = \rho \circ \gamma_z$*

then ρ is injective.

5. UNITIZATIONS OF C^*-ALGEBRAS ASSOCIATED TO TOPOLOGICAL QUIVERS

Recall that a *unitization* of a C^*-algebra A is a unital C^*-algebra B together with an injective homomorphism $i : A \hookrightarrow B$ such that $i(A)$ is an essential ideal of B [47, Definition 2.38]. If A is a nonunital C^*-algebra, then the minimal unitization A^1 is the C^*-algebra equal to $A \oplus \mathbb{C}$ with componentwise addition and with multiplication and involution given by

$$(a, \lambda)(b, \mu) = (ab + \lambda b + \mu a, \lambda\mu) \qquad \text{and} \qquad (a, \lambda)^* = (a^*, \overline{\lambda}).$$

(Strictly speaking the minimal unitization is the pair (A^1, i) where $i : A \hookrightarrow A^1$ by $i(a) = (a, 0)$, however, we typically identify A with $A \oplus 0$ and just refer to A^1 as the minimal unitization.)

If T is a locally compact Hausdorff space, and $T \cup \{\infty\}$ is the one-point compactification of T, then $C_0(T)^1 \cong C(T \cup \{\infty\})$. If we identify $C_0(T)^1$ with $C_0(T) \oplus \mathbb{C}$ as described in the previous paragraph, then the map $f \mapsto (\tilde{f}, f(\infty))$, where $\tilde{f}(x) := f(x) - f(\infty)$, is an isomorphism from $C(T \cup \{\infty\})$ onto $C_0(T) \oplus \mathbb{C}$.

Theorem 5.1. *If $\mathcal{Q} = (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ is a topological quiver, then $C^*(\mathcal{Q})$ is unital if and only if E^0 is compact.*

Proof. Let X be the C^*-correspondence associated to $\mathcal{Q}$, and let $(\psi_{\mathcal{Q}}, \pi_{\mathcal{Q}})$ be a universal Toeplitz representation of X which is coisometric on $C_0(E^0_{\text{reg}})$. If $\{f_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \Lambda}$ is an approximate unit for $C_0(E^0)$, then since X is essential (see Remark 3.5) it follows that $\{\pi_{\mathcal{Q}}(f_\alpha)\}_{\alpha \in \Lambda}$ is an approximate unit for $C^*(\mathcal{Q})$. Now $C^*(\mathcal{Q})$ is unital if and only if $\lim_\alpha \pi_{\mathcal{Q}}(f_\alpha)$ converges to an element in $C^*(\mathcal{Q})$. Since $\pi_{\mathcal{Q}}$ is injective by Corollary 4.5, this limit exists if and only if $\lim_\alpha f_\alpha$ converges to an element of $C_0(E^0)$. But this happens if and only if $C_0(E^0)$ is unital, which occurs if and only if E^0 is compact. $\square$

Definition 5.2. Let $\mathcal{Q} = (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ be a topological quiver, and suppose that E^0 is not compact. If $E^0 \cup \{\infty\}$ denotes the one-point compactification of E^0, then we define a topological quiver $Q^1 = (F^0, F^1, r_1, s_1, \lambda^1)$, where $F^0 := E^0 \cup \{\infty\}$ is the one-point compactification of E^0, $F^1 := E^1$, the maps $r_1, s_1 : E^1 \to E^0 \cup \{\infty\}$ are defined to be the maps r and s composed with the inclusion of E^0 into $E^0 \cup \{\infty\}$; that is $r_1(e) := r(e) \in E^0 \cup \{\infty\}$ and $s_1(e) := s(e) \in E^0 \cup \{\infty\}$, and λ^1 is the family of measures defined by

$$\lambda^1_v := \begin{cases} \lambda_v & \text{if } v \in E^0 \\ 0 & \text{if } v = \infty. \end{cases}$$

Note that $C^*(\mathcal{Q}^1)$ is unital by Theorem 5.1. Also note that if r is a local homeomorphism, then r_1 will be a local homeomorphism. Thus if $\mathcal{Q}$ is a topological graph in the sense of [28], then $\mathcal{Q}^1$ will also be a topological graph.

Proposition 5.3. *If $\mathcal{Q} = (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ is a topological quiver and $\mathcal{Q}^1$ is the topological quiver defined in Definition 5.2, then*

$$E^0_{\text{reg}} = F^0_{\text{reg}}.$$

That is, if we view E^0 as a subset of $E^0 \cup \{\infty\}$, then the regular vertices of $\mathcal{Q}$ are equal to the regular vertices of $\mathcal{Q}^1$.

Proof. Recall that the regular vertices of a topological quiver are characterized by Proposition 3.15. Since $s^{-1}(V) = s_1^{-1}(V)$ and $r^{-1}(V) = r_1^{-1}(V)$ for all $V \subset F^0 \backslash \{\infty\}$, Proposition 3.15 shows that it suffices to prove that $\{\infty\}$ is not a regular vertex of $\mathcal{Q}^1$.

Suppose that ∞ is not a sink of $\mathcal{Q}^1$. Then there exists a sequence of edges $\{\alpha_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ with $\lim_k s_1(\alpha_k) = \infty$. Suppose that there exists a neighborhood $V \subseteq$

$E^0 \cup \{\infty\}$ with $s_1^{-1}(\overline{V})$ compact. Then eventually the α_k's would be in $s_1^{-1}(\overline{V})$ and by compactness there would exist $\alpha \in s_1^{-1}(\overline{V})$ with the property that α is a limit point of the set $\{\alpha_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$. But then $s_1(\alpha) = \lim_k s_1(\alpha_k) = \infty$, which is a contradiction since $s_1^{-1}(\infty) = \emptyset$. Thus if ∞ is not a sink, there does not exist a neighborhood $V \subseteq E^0 \cup \{\infty\}$ with $s_1^{-1}(\overline{V})$ compact. Consequently ∞ is not a regular vertex of $\mathcal{Q}^1$. □

Proposition 5.4. *If $\mathcal{Q} = (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ is a topological quiver, and $\mathcal{Q}^1$ is the topological quiver described in Definition 5.2, then*

$$C^*(\mathcal{Q}^1) \cong C^*(\mathcal{Q})^1.$$

That is, $C^*(\mathcal{Q}^1)$ is isomorphic to the minimal unitization of $C^*(\mathcal{Q})$.

Proof. Let $A := C_0(E^0)$ and $A^1 := C_0(E^0 \cup \infty) = C_0(E^0) \oplus \mathbb{C}$. Let $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_A$ be the A-valued inner product on $C_c(E^1)$ given by

$$\langle \xi, \eta \rangle_A(v) := \int_{r^{-1}(v)} \overline{\xi(\alpha)}\eta(\alpha)\ d\lambda_v(\alpha)$$

and let $\| \cdot \|_A := \| \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_A \|^{1/2}$ be the associated norm on $C_c(E^1)$. We see that $C_c(F^1) = C_c(E^1)$ and if we define an A^1-valued inner product on $C_c(E^1)$ by $\langle \xi, \eta \rangle_{A^1} := (\langle \xi, \eta \rangle_A, 0) \in C_0(E^0) \oplus \mathbb{C}$, then the corresponding norm $\| \cdot \|_{A^1} := \| \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{A^1} \|^{1/2}$ has the property that $\| \cdot \|_{A^1} = \| \cdot \|_A$. Thus we may define $X := \overline{C_c(E^1)}^{\| \cdot \|_A} = \overline{C_c(E^1)}^{\| \cdot \|_{A^1}}$. When we view X as a C^*-correspondence over A as described in §3.1, we shall use the notation X_A, and when we view X as a C^*-correspondence over A^1 as described in §3.1, we shall use the notation X_{A^1}. We see that the following relations hold:

$$\begin{aligned} &(f, \lambda) \cdot \xi = f \cdot \xi + \lambda \xi \\ &\xi \cdot (f, \lambda) = \xi \cdot f + \lambda \xi \\ &\langle \xi, \eta \rangle_{A^1} = (\langle \xi, \eta \rangle_A, 0) \qquad \text{for } (f, \lambda) \in A \oplus \mathbb{C} \text{ and } \xi, \eta \in X. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, X_A is the C^*-correspondence associated to $\mathcal{Q}$, and X_{A^1} is the C^*-correspondence associated to $\mathcal{Q}^1$.

Let $(\psi_{\mathcal{Q}}, \pi_{\mathcal{Q}})$ be the universal Toeplitz representation of X_A into $C^*(\mathcal{Q})$ which is coisometric on $C_0(E^0_{\text{reg}})$. We shall define $\tilde{\psi}_{\mathcal{Q}} : X \to C^*(\mathcal{Q}) \oplus \mathbb{C}$ by

$$\tilde{\psi}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\xi) := (\psi_{\mathcal{Q}}(\xi), 0)$$

and we define $\tilde{\pi}_{\mathcal{Q}} : A^1 \to C^*(\mathcal{Q}) \oplus \mathbb{C}$ by

$$\tilde{\pi}_{\mathcal{Q}}(f, \lambda) := (\pi_{\mathcal{Q}}(f), \lambda).$$

It is easy to verify that $(\tilde{\psi}_{\mathcal{Q}}, \tilde{\pi}_{\mathcal{Q}})$ is a Toeplitz representation of X_{A^1} into $C^*(\mathcal{Q}) \oplus \mathbb{C}$. To see that $(\tilde{\psi}_{\mathcal{Q}}, \tilde{\pi}_{\mathcal{Q}})$ is coisometric on $C_0(F^0_{\text{reg}})$, let $(f, \lambda) \in C_0(F^0_{\text{reg}}) \subseteq A^1 = A \oplus \mathbb{C}$. Then since Proposition 5.3 shows us that the regular vertices of $\mathcal{Q}^1$ are equal to the regular vertices of $\mathcal{Q}$, we must have that $\lambda = 0$ and $f \in C_0(E^0_{\text{reg}})$.

We shall let ϕ_A denote the left action of A on X, and we shall let ϕ_{A^1} denote the left action of A^1 on X. Since $(f, 0) \in C_0(F^0_{\text{reg}}) \subseteq \phi_{A^1}^{-1}(\mathcal{K}(X_{A^1}))$ we have that $\phi_{A^1}(f, 0) = \lim \sum_k \Theta^{X_{A^1}}_{\xi_k, \nu_k}$. Thus for any $\zeta \in X$ we have

$$(\phi_A(f)\zeta, 0) = \phi_{A^1}(f, 0)(\zeta) = \lim \sum_k \Theta^{X_{A^1}}_{\xi_k, \nu_k}(\zeta) = \lim \sum_k \xi_k \langle \nu_k, \zeta \rangle_{A^1}$$

$$= \lim \sum_k (\xi_k \langle \nu_k, \zeta\rangle_A, 0) = (\lim \sum_k \Theta^{X_A}_{\xi_k,\nu_k}(\zeta), 0)$$

which implies that

$$\phi_A(f) = \lim \sum_k \Theta^{X_A}_{\xi_k,\nu_k}.$$

Since $f \in C_0(E^0_{\mathrm{reg}})$ we have that $\pi^{(1)}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\phi_A(f)) = \pi_{\mathcal{Q}}(f)$, and it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\pi}^{(1)}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\phi_{A^1}(f,0)) &= \tilde{\pi}^{(1)}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\lim \sum_k \Theta^{X_{A^1}}_{\xi_k,\nu_k}) = \lim \sum_k \tilde{\psi}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\xi_k)\tilde{\psi}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\nu_k)^* \\ &= \lim \sum_k (\psi_{\mathcal{Q}}(\xi_k), 0)(\psi_{\mathcal{Q}}(\nu_k), 0)^* = (\lim \sum_k \psi_{\mathcal{Q}}(\xi_k)\psi_{\mathcal{Q}}(\nu_k)^*, 0) \\ &= (\pi^{(1)}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\phi_A(f)), 0) = (\pi_{\mathcal{Q}}(f), 0) \\ &= \tilde{\pi}_{\mathcal{Q}}(f, 0)\end{aligned}$$

so that $(\tilde{\psi}_{\mathcal{Q}}, \tilde{\pi}_{\mathcal{Q}})$ is coisometric on $C_0(F^0_{\mathrm{reg}})$.

Let $(\psi_{\mathcal{Q}^1}, \pi_{\mathcal{Q}^1})$ be a universal Toeplitz representation of X_{A^1} in $C^*(\mathcal{Q}^1)$ which is coisometric on $C_0(F^0_{\mathrm{reg}})$. It follows that $(\tilde{\psi}_{\mathcal{Q}}, \tilde{\pi}_{\mathcal{Q}})$ induces a homomorphism $\rho_{(\tilde{\psi}_{\mathcal{Q}}, \tilde{\pi}_{\mathcal{Q}})} : C^*(\mathcal{Q}^1) \to C^*(\mathcal{Q}) \oplus \mathbb{C}$ with

$$\rho_{(\tilde{\psi}_{\mathcal{Q}}, \tilde{\pi}_{\mathcal{Q}})} \circ \psi_{\mathcal{Q}^1} = \tilde{\psi}_{\mathcal{Q}} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \rho_{(\tilde{\psi}_{\mathcal{Q}}, \tilde{\pi}_{\mathcal{Q}})} \circ \pi_{\mathcal{Q}^1} = \tilde{\pi}_{\mathcal{Q}}.$$

Furthermore, if we let $\beta : \mathbb{T} \to \operatorname{Aut} C^*(\mathcal{Q})$ be the canonical action of $\mathbb{T}$ on $C^*(\mathcal{Q})$, then we see that we may define an action $\tilde{\beta} : \mathbb{T} \to \operatorname{Aut}(C^*(\mathcal{Q}) \oplus \mathbb{C})$ by $\tilde{\beta}_z(f, \lambda) = (\beta_z(f), \lambda)$. If $\gamma : \mathbb{T} \to \operatorname{Aut} C^*(\mathcal{Q}^1)$ is the canonical gauge action of $\mathbb{T}$ on $C^*(\mathcal{Q}^1)$, then it follows that $\rho_{(\tilde{\psi}_{\mathcal{Q}}, \tilde{\pi}_{\mathcal{Q}})} \circ \gamma_z = \tilde{\beta}_z \circ \rho_{(\tilde{\psi}_{\mathcal{Q}}, \tilde{\pi}_{\mathcal{Q}})}$ for all $z \in \mathbb{T}$ (simply check on generators to verify this). Because $\rho_{(\tilde{\psi}_{\mathcal{Q}}, \tilde{\pi}_{\mathcal{Q}})}$ is faithful on $\operatorname{im} \pi_{\mathcal{Q}^1}$, it follows from the Gauge-Invariant Uniqueness Theorem (see Theorem 4.7) that $\rho_{(\tilde{\psi}_{\mathcal{Q}}, \tilde{\pi}_{\mathcal{Q}})}$ is injective. In addition $C^*(\tilde{\psi}_{\mathcal{Q}}, \tilde{\pi}_{\mathcal{Q}}) = C^*(\mathcal{Q}) \oplus \mathbb{C}$, so $\rho_{(\tilde{\psi}_{\mathcal{Q}}, \tilde{\pi}_{\mathcal{Q}})}$ is surjective and an isomorphism. □

It is well known that the minimal unitization of a graph C^*-algebra is not necessarily a graph C^*-algebra. However, as the following example shows, we can always realize the minimal unitization of a graph C^*-algebra as a quiver C^*-algebra (in fact, as the C^*-algebra of a topological graph).

Example 5.5. Suppose that $E = (E^0, E^1, r, s)$ is a directed graph and the graph algebra $C^*(E)$ is nonunital. Then it must be the case that E^0 is countably infinite. We may view E as a quiver $\mathcal{Q} = (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ by endowing E^1 and E^0 with the discrete topologies and defining λ_v to be counting measure on $r^{-1}(v)$. If $\mathcal{Q}^1$ is the topological quiver formed from $\mathcal{Q}$ as described in Definition 5.2, then it follows from Proposition 5.4 that $C^*(\mathcal{Q}^1)$ is isomorphic to the minimal unitization of $C^*(E)$. We mention that since r is a local homeomorphism, the map $r_1 : E^1 \to E^0 \cup \{\infty\}$ will also be a local homeomorphism and consequently $\mathcal{Q}^1$ is a topological graph. Furthermore, the one-point compactification $E^0 \cup \{\infty\}$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{N} \cup \infty$, the one-point compactification of $\mathbb{N}$.

6. A CUNTZ-KRIEGER UNIQUENESS THEOREM FOR C^*-ALGEBRAS ASSOCIATED TO TOPOLOGICAL QUIVERS

Our goal in this section is to prove an analogue of the Cuntz-Krieger Uniqueness Theorem [46, Theorem 1.5] for quiver algebras.

Definition 6.1. Let $\mathcal{Q} := (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ be a topological quiver. A *path* in $\mathcal{Q}$ is a finite sequence of edges $\alpha := \alpha_1 \ldots \alpha_n$ with $r(\alpha_i) = s(\alpha_{i+1})$ for $1 \leq i < n$. We say that such a path has length $|\alpha| := n$, and we let E^n denote the paths of length n. We may extend the maps r and s to maps $r^n : E^n \to E^0$ and $s^n : E^n \to E^0$, respectively, by setting $r^n(\alpha) = r(\alpha_n)$ and $s^n(\alpha) = s(\alpha_1)$. When no confusion arises we shall omit the superscript, writing simply r and s for r^n and s^n.

In addition, we endow E^n with the topology it inherits as a subspace of the cartesian product $E^1 \times \ldots \times E^1$. Since s is continuous, and r is continuous and open, we see that for any $n \in N$ the map s^n is continuous and r^n is continuous and open.

We define a Radon measure λ_v^n on E^n inductively in the following manner: For $n = 2$ we define λ_v^2 by

$$\int_{E^2} \xi(\alpha_1\alpha_2) d\lambda_v^2(\alpha_1\alpha_2) := \int_{E^1} \int_{E^1} \xi(\alpha_1\alpha_2)\, d\lambda_{s(\alpha_2)}(\alpha_1)\, d\lambda_v(\alpha_2).$$

Since $\operatorname{supp} \lambda_w = r^{-1}(w)$ for all $w \in E^0$ we see that $\operatorname{supp} \lambda_v^2 = (r^2)^{-1}(v)$.

Lemma 6.2. *If $\xi \in C_c(E^2)$, then $v \mapsto \int_{(r^2)^{-1}(v)} \xi(\alpha_1\alpha_2) d\lambda_v^2(\alpha_1\alpha_2)$ is in $C_c(E^0)$.*

Proof. It follows from the Stone-Weierstrass Theorem that the set of all sums of functions of the form $\Gamma(\alpha_1\alpha_2) = g(\alpha_1)h(\alpha_2)$ for $g, h \in C_c(E^1)$ is dense in $C_c(E^2)$. Thus it suffices to prove that $v \mapsto \int_{(r^2)^{-1}} g(\alpha_1)h(\alpha_2)\, d\lambda_v^2(\alpha_1\alpha_2)$ is in $C_c(E^0)$. To do this, define $G(v) := \int_{r^{-1}(v)} g(\alpha)\, d\lambda_v(\alpha)$. Then since s is continuous, the function $\beta \mapsto G(s(\beta))$ is in $C_b(E^1)$. Consequently $\beta \mapsto G(s(\beta))h(\beta)$ is in $C_c(E^1)$ and since $G(s(\beta))h(\beta) = \int_{E^1} g(\alpha)h(\beta)\, d\lambda_{s(\beta)}(\alpha)$ we see that $v \mapsto \int_{E^1} \int_{E^1} g(\alpha)h(\beta)\, d\lambda_{s(\beta)}(\alpha)\, d\lambda_v(\beta)$ is in $C_c(E^0)$. $\square$

Continuing inductively, we may define a Radon measure λ_v^n on E^n by setting

$$\int_{E^n} \xi(\alpha_1 \ldots \alpha_n)\, d\lambda_v^n(\alpha_1 \ldots \alpha_n) := \int_{E^{n-1}} \int_{E^1} \xi(\alpha_1 \ldots \alpha_n)\, d\lambda_{s(\alpha_2 \ldots \alpha_n)}(\alpha_1)\, d\lambda_v^{n-1}(\alpha_2 \ldots \alpha_n).$$

Furthermore, $\operatorname{supp} \lambda_v^n = (r^n)^{-1}(v)$, and just as in Lemma 6.2 we can show that if $\xi \in C_c(E^n)$, then

$$v \mapsto \int_{(r^n)^{-1}(v)} \xi(\alpha_1 \ldots \alpha_n)\, d\lambda_v^n(\alpha_1 \ldots \alpha_n)$$

is in $C_c(E^0)$.

This fact implies that if $\mathcal{Q} := (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ is a topological quiver, then $\mathcal{Q}^n := (E^0, E^1, r^n, s^n, \lambda^n)$ is a topological quiver as well. We let $X(\mathcal{Q}^n)$ denote the C^*-correspondence over $A = C_0(E^0)$ associated to $\mathcal{Q}^n$.

If $\mathcal{Q} := (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ is a topological quiver, and $X = X(Q)$ is the C^*-correspondence over $A = C_0(E^0)$ associated to $\mathcal{Q}$, then we view $X^{\otimes n} := X \otimes_A$

$\ldots \otimes_A X$ as a C^*-correspondence in the natural way (see [39, §2.2]). The connection between the path spaces E^n and the tensor powers $X^{\otimes n}$ is given by the natural map of the algebraic tensor product $C_c(E^1)^{\odot n}$ into $C_c(E^n)$ which takes an elementary tensor $x_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes x_n$ to the function $\alpha \mapsto x_1(\alpha_1) \cdots x_n(\alpha_n)$. A calculation using the inductive definition of λ^n shows that this map is isometric for the $C_0(E^0)$-valued inner products on $C_c(E^1)^{\odot n} \subset X^{\otimes n}$ and $X(\mathcal{Q}^n)$. We shall use this natural map to identify $C_c(E^1)^{\odot n}$ with subspaces of $C_c(E^n)$, $X^{\otimes n}$, and $X(\mathcal{Q}^n)$; an application of the Stone-Weierstrass theorem shows that the elementary tensors then span a dense subspace of $C_c(E^n)$ (for the inductive limit topology) and $X(\mathcal{Q}^n)$. This identification also preserves the left and right actions of $C_0(E^0)$, and hence allows us to identify the correspondences $X^{\otimes n}$ and $X(\mathcal{Q}^n)$.

Remark 6.3. If X is a C^*-correspondence and (ψ, π) is a Toeplitz representation of X in a C^*-algebra B, then it was shown in [19, Lemma 3.6] that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there is a linear map $\psi^{\otimes n} : X^{\otimes n} \to B$ which satisfies

$$\psi^{\otimes n}(x_1 \otimes_A \ldots \otimes_A x_n) = \psi(x_1) \ldots \psi(x_n) \qquad \text{for } x_1, \ldots x_n \in X.$$

Furthermore, $(\psi^{\otimes n}, \pi)$ is a Toeplitz representation of $X^{\otimes n}$ in B and there exists a representation $\pi^{(n)} : \mathcal{K}(X^{\otimes n}) \to B$ such that

$$\pi^{(n)}(\Theta_{x,y}) = \psi^{\otimes n}(x)\psi^{\otimes n}(y)^* \qquad \text{for } x, y \in X^{\otimes n}.$$

In addition, if (ψ, π) is Cuntz-Pimsner covariant, and if we let 1^k denote the identity operator on $X^{\otimes k}$ and define

$$\mathcal{C}_n := A \otimes_A 1^n + \mathcal{K}(X) \otimes_A 1^{n-1} + \mathcal{K}(X^{\otimes 2}) \otimes_A 1^{n-2} + \ldots \mathcal{K}(X^{\otimes n}),$$

then the homomorphism $\kappa_n^{\psi,\pi} : \mathcal{C}_n \to B$ given by

$$\kappa_n^{\psi,\pi}(k_0 \otimes_A 1^n + k_1 \otimes_A 1^{n-1} + \ldots + k_n) := \pi(k_0) + \pi^{(1)}(k_1) + \ldots \pi^{(n)}(k_n)$$

is faithful whenever π is faithful [19, Proposition 4.6]. It is also a fact that if $\mathcal{C} := \varinjlim \mathcal{C}_n$ under the isometric homomorphisms $c \in \mathcal{C}_n \mapsto c \otimes_A 1 \in \mathcal{C}_{n+1}$, then the homomorphisms $\kappa_n^{\psi,\pi} : \mathcal{C}_n \to B$ induce a map $\kappa^{\psi,\pi} : \mathcal{C} \to B$, and [19, Corollary 4.8] shows that $\kappa^{\psi,\pi}$ is faithful when π is. Furthermore, [19, Corollary 4.9] shows that if ϕ is faithful and (ψ_X, π_A) is a universal Toeplitz representation of X in $\mathcal{O}_X$ which is coisometric on $J_X = J(X)$, then $\kappa^{\psi_X,\pi_A} : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{O}_X$ is a faithful map onto the fixed point algebra $\mathcal{O}_X^\gamma$.

Throughout the following lemmas let $\mathcal{Q} := (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ be a topological quiver. Also let X be the C^*-correspondence associated to $\mathcal{Q}$, and for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ view $C_c(E^n)$ as a subset of $X^{\otimes n}$.

Lemma 6.4. *Let (ψ, π) be a Toeplitz representation of X. If $\xi \in C_c(E^n)$, $\eta \in C_c(E^m)$, and $m > n$, then*

$$\psi^{\otimes n}(\xi)^* \psi^{\otimes m}(\eta) = \psi^{\otimes (m-n)}(\zeta)$$

where $\zeta \in C_c(E^{m-n})$ is given by

$$\zeta(\alpha) := \int_{(r^n)^{-1}(s(\alpha))} \overline{\xi(\beta)} \eta(\beta\alpha) \, d\lambda^n_{s(\alpha)}(\beta).$$

Proof. If $\eta = \eta_1 \otimes \eta_2$ where $\eta_1 \in C_c(E^n)$ and $\eta_2 \in C_c(E^{m-n})$, then the function $\zeta \in C_c(E^{m-n})$ defined above satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}\zeta(\alpha) &= \int_{(r^n)^{-1}(s(\alpha))} \overline{\xi(\alpha)}\eta_1(\beta)\eta_2(\alpha)\, d\lambda^n_{s(\alpha)}(\beta)\\ &= \langle \xi, \eta_1\rangle(s(\alpha))\ \eta_2(\alpha)\\ &= (\langle \xi, \eta_1\rangle \cdot \eta_2)(\alpha)\end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned}\psi^{\otimes n}(\xi)^*\psi^{\otimes m}(\eta) &= \psi^{\otimes n}(\xi)^*\psi^{\otimes n}(\eta_1)\psi^{\otimes(m-n)}(\eta_2)\\ &= \pi(\langle \xi, \eta\rangle)\psi^{\otimes(m-n)}(\eta_2)\\ &= \psi^{\otimes(m-n)}(\langle \xi, \eta\rangle \cdot \eta_2)\\ &= \psi^{\otimes(m-n)}(\zeta).\end{aligned}$$

Since the linear combinations of elements of the form $\eta_1 \otimes \eta_2$ is dense in $C_c(E^m)$, the claim holds for all $\eta \in C_c(E^m)$. ☐

Definition 6.5. A path $\alpha := \alpha_1 \dots \alpha_n \in E^n$ is *returning* if $\alpha_k = \alpha_n$ for some $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, n-1\}$. Otherwise α is said to be *nonreturning.*

Definition 6.6. A nonempty subset $U \subseteq E^n$ is *nonreturning* if whenever $\alpha = \alpha_1 \dots \alpha_n \in U$ and $\beta = \beta_1 \dots \beta_n \in U$ we have that $\alpha_n \neq \beta_k$ for all $k \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$.

Lemma 6.7. *Let (ψ, π) be a Toeplitz representation of X and let $U \subseteq E^m$ be an open set that is nonreturning. If $\zeta \in C_c(U) \subseteq X^{\otimes m}$ and $\xi \in X^{\otimes n}$ for some $n \in \{1, \dots m-1\}$, then $\psi^{\otimes m}(\zeta)^*\psi^{\otimes n}(\xi)\psi^{\otimes m}(\zeta) = 0$.*

Proof. Since $C_c(E^n)$ is dense in $X^{\otimes n}$, it suffices to prove the claim when $\xi \in C_c(E^n)$. By Lemma 6.4 we have that $\psi^{\otimes m}(\zeta)^*\psi^{\otimes n}(\xi)\psi^{\otimes m}(\zeta) = \psi^{\otimes n}(\eta)$ where $\eta \in C_c(E^n)$ is defined by

$$\eta(\alpha) := \int_{(r^m)^{-1}(s(\alpha))} \overline{\zeta(\beta_1 \dots \beta_m)}\xi(\beta_1 \dots \beta_n)\zeta(\beta_{n+1} \dots \beta_m\alpha)\ d\lambda^m_{s(\alpha)}(\beta_1 \dots \beta_m).$$

But since U is nonreturning $\beta_1 \dots \beta_m \in U$ implies $\beta_{n+1} \dots \beta_m\alpha \notin U$. Thus $\eta = 0$ and the claim holds. ☐

Definition 6.8. A path $\alpha = \alpha_1 \dots \alpha_n \in E^n$ is said to be a *loop* if $s(\alpha_1) = r(\alpha_n)$, and we call $s(\alpha_1)$ the *base point* of the loop α. An *exit* for a loop $\alpha = \alpha_1 \dots \alpha_n$ is an edge $\beta \in E^1$ such that $s(\beta) = s(\alpha_k)$ for some $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and $\beta \neq \alpha_k$.

Definition 6.9. The following condition generalizes Condition (L) defined for graphs in [34] (which, in turn, is the analogue of Condition (I) for Cuntz-Krieger algebras).

Condition (L): The set of base points of loops in $\mathcal{Q}$ with no exits has empty interior.

Lemma 6.10. *Let $\mathcal{Q}$ be a topological quiver with no sinks. Let V be an open subset of E^0 with the property that there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that whenever α is a path in $\mathcal{Q}$ with $|\alpha| \geq n$ and $s(\alpha) \in V$, then α is returning. Then for every path $\beta = \beta_1 \dots \beta_n \in (s^n)^{-1}(V)$ there exists $k \in \{2, \dots, n\}$ such that $\beta_k \dots \beta_n$ is a loop with no exits.*

Proof. Let $\beta_1 \dots \beta_n \in (s^n)^{-1}(V)$. Since β is returning there exists $k \in \{2, \dots, n\}$ such that $\beta_{k-1} = \beta_n$. We shall show that $\beta_k \dots \beta_n$ is a loop with no exits. Suppose to the contrary that δ is an exit for $\beta_k \dots \beta_n$. Then there exists $l \in \{k, \dots, n\}$ such that $s(\delta) = s(\beta_l)$ and $\delta \neq \beta_l$. Let $v := s(\delta) = s(\beta_l)$ and set $m := \min\{j \in \{1, \dots, l\} : s(\beta_j) = v\}$. Then $r(\beta_{m-1}) = v$ and $\beta_j \neq \delta$ for $j \leq m-1$. In addition, since $\beta_k \dots \beta_n$ is a loop, we may find a subloop $\gamma = \gamma_1 \dots \gamma_p$ with $\gamma_1 = \beta_l$ and $s(\gamma_j) \neq v$ for $j \in \{2, \dots, p\}$. Consequently $\gamma_j \neq \delta$ for $j \in \{1, \dots, p\}$. Consider the path

$$\beta_1 \dots \beta_{m-1} \gamma\gamma \dots \gamma\delta$$

where the γ's are repeated sufficiently many times that the path has length greater than n. Then this path has source $s(\beta_i) \in V$ and is nonreturning, which contradicts the hypothesis on V. Hence $\beta_k \dots \beta_n$ has no exits. □

Lemma 6.11. *Suppose that $\mathcal{Q}$ is a topological quiver with no sinks that satisfies Condition (L). If V is an open subset of E^0 and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then there exists a nonreturning path $\alpha \in (s^m)^{-1}(V)$ for some $m \geq n$.*

Proof. Suppose to the contrary that whenever $m \geq n$, then every path in $(s^m)^{-1}(V)$ is returning. Then Lemma 6.10 implies that every element in the nonempty open subset $r^m((s^m)^{-1}(V))$ is the base point of a loop with no exits. But this contradicts the fact that $\mathcal{Q}$ satisfies Condition (L). □

Lemma 6.12. *Let V be an open subset of E^0 and let $\alpha \in (s^n)^{-1}(V)$ for $n \geq 1$ be a path that is nonreturning. Then there exists a nonempty open set $U \subseteq (s^n)^{-1}(V)$ that is nonreturning and contains α.*

Proof. Since $\alpha := \alpha_1 \dots \alpha_n$ is a nonreturning path we may choose open subsets $U_1, U_2, \dots, U_n \subseteq E^1$ with $\alpha_k \in U_k$ and $U_k \cap U_n \neq \emptyset$ for all $k \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$. In addition, after possibly shrinking U_n we may assume that $U_n \subseteq s^{-1}(V)$. Then $U := (U_1 \times \dots \times U_n) \cap E^n$ is nonreturning with $U \subseteq (s^n)^{-1}(V)$. □

Lemma 6.13. *If $T \in \mathcal{L}(X^{\otimes n})$, then for all $\epsilon > 0$ there exist $\xi, \eta \in X^{\otimes n}$ with $\|\xi\|, \|\eta\| \leq 1$ and such that*

$$g := \langle \xi, T\eta \rangle$$

is a positive function with $\|g\| > \|T\| - \epsilon$. Furthermore, if T is a positive operator we may choose $\xi = \eta$.

Proof. For any $\epsilon > 0$ there exist $\xi', \eta' \in X^{\otimes n}$ with $\|\xi'\|, \|\eta'\| \leq 1$ and such that

$$h := \langle \xi', T\eta' \rangle$$

is a function with $\|h\| > \|T\| - \epsilon$. Let $U := \operatorname{osupp} h$, let V be a nonempty precompact neighborhood with $\overline{V} \subseteq \{v \in E^0 : |h(v)| > \|T\| - \epsilon\}$, and let K be a nonempty compact subset of V. Define a function $c \in C_b(V)$ by $c(v) := \frac{\overline{h(v)}}{|h(v)|}$ and extend c to a continuous function on E^0 with norm 1. Also let $b : E^0 \to [0, 1]$ be a continuous function with $b|_K \equiv 1$ and $b|_{E^0 \setminus V} \equiv 0$. Set $\xi := \xi' \cdot bc$ and $\eta := \eta'$. Then $g := \langle \xi, T\eta \rangle$ has the property that

$$g = \langle \xi' \cdot bc, T\eta' \rangle = \langle \xi', T\eta' \rangle \cdot bc = hbc = |h|b.$$

Thus $g \geq 0$ and since $|h|b$ takes on values greater than $\|T\| - \epsilon$ on K we see that $\|g\| > \|T\| - \epsilon$.

Furthermore, if T is a positive operator, then $\|T\| = \sup\{\langle \xi, T\xi \rangle : \|\xi\| = 1\}$ so we may choose $\xi' = \eta'$ above. If we then let $\xi = \xi' \cdot \sqrt{bc}$, the above shows that $g := \langle \xi, T\xi \rangle$ has the desired properties. $\square$

The proof of the following proposition is based on [28, Proposition 5.10] where the result was proven in the case that r is a local homeomorphism. The proof of [28, Proposition 5.10] involves four cases (more specifically, two cases each of which has two subcases), however, because of our technique of adding tails to sinks and Theorem 4.3, we will only need the result for topological quivers which do not contain sinks. Consequently, we will only need to consider one of these four cases and this will simplify the proof substantially.

Proposition 6.14. *Let $\mathcal{Q} := (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ be a topological quiver with no sinks that satisfies Condition (L), and let X be the C^*-correspondence over $A = C_0(E^0)$ associated to $\mathcal{Q}$. Also let (ψ, π) be a Toeplitz representation of X in a C^*-algebra B with the property that π is injective. If $\xi_l \in X^{\otimes n_l}$ and $\eta_l \in X^{\otimes m_l}$ for $l = 1, 2, \ldots L$, and we set $x = \sum_{l=1}^{L} \psi^{\otimes n_l}(\xi_l)\psi^{\otimes m_l}(\eta_l)^*$ and $x_0 = \sum_{n_l = m_l} \psi^{\otimes n_l}(\xi_l)\psi^{\otimes m_l}(\eta_l)^*$, then for any $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $a, b \in B$ and $f \in C_0(E^0)$ such that $\|a\|, \|b\| \leq 1$, $\|f\| = \|x_0\|$, and $\|a^* x b - \pi(f)\| < \epsilon$. Furthermore, if x is positive we may choose $a = b$.*

Proof. Let $\epsilon > 0$ and set $n = \max\{n_1, \ldots, n_L, m_1, \ldots m_L\}$. By [19, Proposition 4.6] the map $\kappa_n^{\psi,\pi} : \mathcal{C}_n \to B$ is injective, and since $x_0 = \sum_{n_l = m_l} \psi^{\otimes n_l}(\xi_l)\psi^{\otimes m_l}(\eta_l)^* \in \operatorname{im} \kappa_n^{\psi,\pi}$ there exists $T \in \mathcal{C}_n \subseteq \mathcal{L}(X^{\otimes n})$ with $\kappa_n^{\psi,\pi}(T) = x_0$ and $\|T\| = \|x_0\|$. By Lemma 6.13 there exists $\xi, \eta \in X^{\otimes n}$ with $\|\xi\|, \|\eta\| \leq 1$ and such that $g := \langle \xi, T\eta \rangle \in C_0(E^0)$ is a positive function with $\|g\| > \|x_0\| - \epsilon$. Since g is continuous there exists a nonempty open subset $V \subseteq E^0$ with $|g(v)| > \|x_0\| - \epsilon$ for all $v \in V$. When $n_l > m_l$ we have

$$\psi^{\otimes n}(\xi)^* \psi^{\otimes n_l}(\xi_l)\psi^{\otimes m_l}(\eta_l)^* \psi^{\otimes n}(\eta) = \psi^{\otimes n_l'}(\xi_l')$$

for some $\xi_l' \in X^{\otimes n_l'}$ where $n_l' := n_l - m_l$. Similarly, when $n_l < m_l$ we have

$$\psi^{\otimes n}(\xi)^* \psi^{\otimes n_l}(\xi_l)\psi^{\otimes m_l}(\eta_l)^* \psi^{\otimes n}(\eta) = \psi^{\otimes m_l'}(\eta_l')$$

for some $\eta_l' \in X^{\otimes m_l'}$ where $m_l' := m_l - n_l$. Thus we have

$$\psi^{\otimes n}(\xi)^* x \psi^{\otimes n}(\eta) = \pi(g) + \sum_{n_l > m_l} \psi^{\otimes n_l'}(\xi_l') + \sum_{n_l < m_l} \psi^{\otimes m_l'}(\eta_l')^*. \tag{6.1}$$

By Lemma 6.11 there exists a nonreturning path $\alpha \in E^m$ with $m > n$ and $s(\alpha) \in V$. Hence by Lemma 6.12 there exists a nonempty open set $U \subseteq (s^m)^{-1}(V)$ which is nonreturning. Choose a nonzero compactly supported function $\zeta' \in C_c(E^m)$ with $0 \leq \zeta' \leq 1$ and $\operatorname{supp} \zeta' \subseteq U$. Since the function $v \mapsto \int_{(r^m)^{-1}(v)} |\zeta'(\beta)|^2 d\lambda_v^m(\beta)$ is continuous and compactly supported, there exists a vertex $v_0 \in E^0$ at which it attains its maximum. Let $k := \int_{(r^m)^{-1}(v_0)} |\zeta'(\beta)|^2 d\lambda_{v_0}^m(\beta)$ and set $\zeta := \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}}\zeta'$. If we let $f' := \langle \zeta, g\zeta \rangle$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\|f'\| &= \sup_{v \in E^0} \int_{(r^m)^{-1}(v)} \zeta(\beta) g(s(\beta)) \zeta(\beta) \ d\lambda_v^m(\beta) \\
&> (\|x_0\| - \epsilon) \sup_{v \in E^0} \int_{(r^m)^{-1}(v)} |\zeta(\beta)|^2 \ d\lambda_v^m(\beta)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= (\|x_0\| - \epsilon)\ \frac{1}{k}\ \sup_{v \in E^0} \int_{(r^m)^{-1}(v)} |\zeta'(\beta)|^2\ d\lambda_v^m(\beta) \\
&= (\|x_0\| - \epsilon)\ \frac{1}{k}\ \int_{(r^m)^{-1}(v_0)} |\zeta'(\beta)|^2\ d\lambda_{v_0}^m(\beta) \\
&= \|x_0\| - \epsilon
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\|f'\| &= \sup_{v \in E^0} \int_{(r^m)^{-1}(v)} \zeta(\beta) g(s(\beta)) \zeta(\beta)\ d\lambda_v^m(\beta) \\
&\leq \|g\| \sup_{v \in E^0} \int_{(r^m)^{-1}(v)} |\zeta(\beta)|^2\ d\lambda_v^m(\beta) \\
&= \|g\|\ \frac{1}{k}\ \sup_{v \in E^0} \int_{(r^m)^{-1}(v)} |\zeta'(\beta)|^2\ d\lambda_v^m(\beta) \\
&= \|g\|\ \frac{1}{k}\ \int_{(r^m)^{-1}(v_0)} |\zeta'(\beta)|^2\ d\lambda_{v_0}^m(\beta) \\
&= \|g\| \\
&< \|x_0\| + \epsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

These two inequalities show that $\big| \|f'\| - \|x_0\| \big| < \epsilon$. If we let $a := \psi^{\otimes n}(\xi)\psi^{\otimes m}(\zeta)$ and $b := \psi^{\otimes n}(\eta)\psi^{\otimes m}(\zeta)$, then $\|a\|, \|b\| \leq 1$ and

$$a^* x b = \psi^{\otimes m}(\zeta)^* (\psi^{\otimes n}(\xi)^* x \psi^{\otimes n}(\eta)) \psi^{\otimes m}(\zeta) = \pi(f')$$

by Lemma 6.7 and Eq. 6.1. If we let $f := \frac{\|x_0\|}{\|f'\|} f'$, then $\|f\| = \|x_0\|$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
\|a^* x b - \pi(f)\| &= \|\pi(f - f')\| \leq \|f' - f\| = \left\| f' - \frac{\|x_0\|}{\|f'\|} f' \right\| \\
&= \left| 1 - \frac{\|x_0\|}{\|f'\|} \right| \cdot \|f'\| = \big| \|f'\| - \|x_0\| \big| < \epsilon
\end{aligned}$$

and the claim holds.

Furthermore, if x is positive, then $T := (\kappa_n^{\psi,\pi})^{-1}(x_0)$ is positive and by Lemma 6.13 we may choose $\xi = \eta$. But then we will have that $a = b$. □

Lemma 6.15. *Let $\mathcal{Q} := (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ be a topological quiver with no sinks that satisfies Condition (L), let X be the C^*-correspondence over $A = C_0(E^0)$ associated to $\mathcal{Q}$, and let $(\psi_{\mathcal{Q}}, \pi_{\mathcal{Q}})$ be a universal Toeplitz representation of X into $C^*(\mathcal{Q})$ which is coisometric on $C_0(E^0_{\text{reg}}) = C_0(E^0_{\text{fin}})$. If $\rho : C^*(\mathcal{Q}) \to C$ is a $*$-homomorphism from $C^*(\mathcal{Q})$ into a C^*-algebra C with the property that the restriction $\rho|_{\pi_{\mathcal{Q}}(A)}$ is injective, then ρ is injective.*

Proof. Let γ denote the gauge action on $C^*(\mathcal{Q})$ and let E denote the conditional expectation obtained by averaging γ over $\mathbb{T}$ with respect to Haar measure; that is,

$$E(x) := \int_{\mathbb{T}} \gamma_z(x)\ dz.$$

We shall show that the following two statements hold:

(a.) ρ is faithful on the fixed point algebra $C^*(\mathcal{Q})^\gamma$

(b.) $\|\rho(E(x))\| \leq \|\rho(x)\|$ for all $x \in C^*(\mathcal{Q})$.

To see (a) let $\psi := \rho \circ \psi_{\mathcal{Q}}$ and $\pi := \rho \circ \pi_{\mathcal{Q}}$. Then we see that $\kappa_n^{\psi,\pi} = \rho_{(\psi,\pi)} \circ \kappa^{\psi_{\mathcal{Q}},\pi_{\mathcal{Q}}} = \rho \circ \kappa^{\psi_{\mathcal{Q}},\pi_{\mathcal{Q}}}$ and since $\kappa^{\psi,\pi}$ is faithful by [19, Corollary 4.8], it follows that ρ is faithful on $\operatorname{im} \kappa^{\psi_{\mathcal{Q}},\pi_{\mathcal{Q}}} = \mathcal{O}_X^\gamma = C^*(\mathcal{Q})^\gamma$, so (a) holds.

To see (b) note that since

$$C^*(\mathcal{Q}) = \overline{\operatorname{span}}\{\psi_{\mathcal{Q}}^{\otimes n}(\xi)\psi_{\mathcal{Q}}^{\otimes m}(\eta)^* : \xi \in X^{\otimes n}, \eta \in X^{\otimes m}, \text{ and } n, m \geq 0\}$$

it suffices to prove (b) when x has the form $x = \sum_{l=1}^{L} \psi_{\mathcal{Q}}^{\otimes n_l}(\xi_l)\psi_{\mathcal{Q}}^{\otimes m_l}(\eta_l)^*$. Keeping the notation $(\psi, \pi) = (\rho \circ \psi_{\mathcal{Q}}, \rho \circ \pi_{\mathcal{Q}})$, we see that if $y := \sum_{l=1}^{L} \psi^{\otimes n_l}(\xi_l)\psi^{\otimes m_l}(\eta_l)^*$ and $y_0 := \sum_{n_l = m_l} \psi^{\otimes n_l}(\xi_l)\psi^{\otimes m_l}(\eta_l)^*$, then by Proposition 6.14 for all $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $a, b \in C$ and $f \in C_0(E^0)$ such that $\|a\|, \|b\| \leq 1$, $\|f\| = \|y_0\|$, and $\|a^*yb - \pi(f)\| < \epsilon$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\|\rho(E(x))\| &= \|\rho(\sum_{n_l=m_l} \psi_{\mathcal{Q}}^{\otimes n_l}(\xi_l)\psi_{\mathcal{Q}}^{\otimes m_l}(\eta_l)^*)\| = \|y_0\| = \|f\| = \|\rho(\pi_{\mathcal{Q}}(f))\| = \|\pi(f)\| \\ &\leq \|a^*yb\| + \|\pi(f) - a^*yb\| < \|a\|\,\|y\|\,\|b\| + \epsilon \leq \|y\| + \epsilon = \|\rho(x)\| + \epsilon.\end{aligned}$$

Since this inequality holds for all $\epsilon > 0$ we have that $\|\rho(E(x))\| \leq \|\rho(x)\|$, so (b) holds.

Finally, given (a) and (b) we see that whenever $\rho(x) = 0$ we have $\rho(x^*x) = 0$ and (b) implies that $\rho(E(x^*x)) = 0$. But then $E(x^*x) = 0$ by (a), and since E is faithful this implies that $x = 0$. Thus ρ is injective. □

Theorem 6.16 (Cuntz-Krieger Uniqueness)**.** *Let $\mathcal{Q} := (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ be a topological quiver that satisfies Condition (L), let X be the C^*-correspondence over $A = C_0(E^0)$ associated to $\mathcal{Q}$, and let $(\psi_{\mathcal{Q}}, \pi_{\mathcal{Q}})$ be a universal Toeplitz representation of X into $C^*(\mathcal{Q})$ which is coisometric on $C_0(E^0_{\text{reg}})$. If $\rho : C^*(\mathcal{Q}) \to C$ is a $*$-homomorphism from $C^*(\mathcal{Q})$ into a C^*-algebra C with the property that the restriction $\rho|_{\pi_{\mathcal{Q}}(A)}$ is injective, then ρ is injective.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{Q}'$ be the topological quiver formed by adding tails to the sinks of $\mathcal{Q}$, and let Y be the C^*-correspondence associated to $\mathcal{Q}'$. If $(\psi_{\mathcal{Q}}, \pi_{\mathcal{Q}})$ is a universal representation of X which is coisometric on $C_0(E^0_{\text{reg}})$, then by Theorem 4.3(c) we may identify $(C^*(\mathcal{Q}), \psi_{\mathcal{Q}}, \pi_{\mathcal{Q}})$ with $(S, \psi_{\mathcal{Q}'}|_X, \pi_{\mathcal{Q}'}|_A)$, where S is the subalgebra of $C^*(\mathcal{Q}')$ generated by $\{\psi_{\mathcal{Q}'}(\xi, \vec{0}), \pi_{\mathcal{Q}'}(a, \vec{0}) : \xi \in X, a \in A\}$ and $(\psi_{\mathcal{Q}'}, \pi_{\mathcal{Q}'})$ is a universal Toeplitz representation of Y into $C^*(\mathcal{Q}')$. In addition, we may realize C as a subalgebra of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{Q}})$ for some Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{Q}}$. Now by Theorem 4.3(a) we may extend $\rho : S \to \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{Q}})$ to a homomorphism $\tilde{\rho} : C^*(\mathcal{Q}') \to \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{Q}} \oplus \mathcal{H}_T)$ with the property that $\tilde{\rho}|_{\pi_{\mathcal{Q}'}(B)}$ is injective. Since $\mathcal{Q}'$ has no sinks, we may conclude from Lemma 6.15 that $\tilde{\rho}$ is injective, and consequently ρ is injective. □

7. Relative Quiver Algebras

A *relative quiver algebra* is a C^*-algebra of the form $\mathcal{O}(C_0(V), X)$, where $\mathcal{Q} = (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ is a topological quiver, X is the C^*-correspondence associated to $\mathcal{Q}$, and V is an open subset of E^0_{reg}. In this section we shall show that any relative quiver algebra is isomorphic to the C^*-algebra of a (possibly different) quiver.

Definition 7.1. If A is a subset of a topological space X, then the *boundary of A* is defined to be $\operatorname{Bd}(A) := \overline{A} \cap \overline{(X \backslash A)}$.

Definition 7.2. Let $\mathcal{Q} = (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ be a topological quiver, and let V be an open subset of E^0_{reg}. We define a quiver $\mathcal{Q}(V) := (F^0, F^1, \tilde{r}, \tilde{s}, \tilde{\lambda})$ as follows:

We first set $C := E^0_{\text{reg}} \backslash V$ and $W := \operatorname{Int} C$.

To form F^0 we begin by taking the disjoint union of two copies of E^0. More formally, we identify E^0 with

$$E^0 \times \{0\} = \{(v, 0) : v \in E^0\}$$

and

$$E^0 \times \{1\} = \{(v, 1) : v \in E^0\}$$

and consider $(E^0 \times \{0\}) \sqcup (E^0 \times \{1\})$. We then define an equivalence relation $\sim$ on this disjoint union by

$$(v, 0) \sim (v, 1) \qquad \text{if } v \in E^0 \backslash W$$

and we set $F^0 := ((E^0 \times \{0\}) \sqcup (E^0 \times \{1\}))/\sim$ with the quotient topology.

Similarly, we identify E^1 with

$$E^1 \times \{0\} = \{(\alpha, 0) : \alpha \in E^1\}$$

and

$$E^1 \times \{1\} = \{(\alpha, 1) : \alpha \in E^1\}$$

and define an equivalence relation $\sim$ on the disjoint union $(E^1 \times \{0\}) \sqcup (E^1 \times \{1\})$ by

$$(\alpha, 0) \sim (\alpha, 1) \qquad \text{if } \alpha \in E^1 \backslash r^{-1}(W).$$

We then define $F^1 := ((E^1 \times \{0\}) \sqcup (E^1 \times \{1\}))/\sim$ with the quotient topology.

Next we define $\tilde{s} : F^1 \to F^0$ by

$$\tilde{s}(\alpha, k) = (s(\alpha), 0) \qquad \text{for } (\alpha, k) \in F^1$$

and we define $\tilde{r} : F^1 \to F^0$ by

$$\tilde{r}(\alpha, k) = (r(\alpha), k) \qquad \text{for } (\alpha, k) \in F^1.$$

Note that $\tilde{r}$ and $\tilde{s}$ are well defined.

Finally, we define the measure $\tilde{\lambda}$. For any $(v, k) \in F^0$ we see that $\tilde{r}^{-1}(v, k) = r^{-1}(v) \times \{k\}$, which may be identified with $r^{-1}(v)$, and we let $\tilde{\lambda}_{(v,k)}$ equal λ_v on this space.

Remark 7.3. Using the definition of the quotient topology it is straightforward to show that $\mathcal{Q}(V)$ as defined above is in fact a topological quiver. Also note that we may view F^0 as formed by adding a copy of W to E^0 and attaching it at $\operatorname{Bd}(W)$, and we may view F^1 as formed by adding a copy of $r^{-1}(W)$ to E^1 and attaching it at $\operatorname{Bd}(r^{-1}(W)) = r^{-1}(\operatorname{Bd}(W))$.

Remark 7.4. If $f, g \in C_0(E^0)$ with $f|_{E^0 \backslash W} = g|_{E^0 \backslash W}$, then we may form a function $(f, g) \in C_0(F^0)$ by

$$(f, g)(v, k) := \begin{cases} f(v) & k = 0 \\ g(v) & k = 1. \end{cases}$$

Furthermore, one can show that every element of $C_0(F^0)$ has this form. Likewise, if $\xi, \eta \in C_c(E^1)$ with $\xi|_{E^1 \backslash r^{-1}(W)} = \eta|_{E^1 \backslash r^{-1}(W)}$, then we may form a function $(\xi, \eta) \in C_c(F^1)$ by

$$(\xi, \eta)(\alpha, k) := \begin{cases} \xi(\alpha) & k = 0 \\ \eta(\alpha) & k = 1. \end{cases}$$

Furthermore, one can show that every element of $C_c(F^1)$ has this form.

Throughout this section we will fix a quiver $\mathcal{Q} = (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ and an open subset V of E^0_{reg}. We will consider the quiver $\mathcal{Q}(V) := (F^0, F^1, \tilde{r}, \tilde{s}, \tilde{\lambda})$ as defined in Definition 7.2 and identify $C_0(F^0)$ and $C_c(F^1)$ with the pairs of functions described in Remark 7.4. We shall also let $C := E^0_{\text{reg}} \backslash V$ and $W := \operatorname{Int} C$ throughout.

We see that if X is the C^*-correspondence over $A = C_0(E^0)$ associated to $\mathcal{Q}$ with left action $\phi : A \to \mathcal{L}(X)$, and if Y is the C^*-correspondence over $B = C_0(F^0)$ associated to $\mathcal{Q}(V)$ with left action $\phi_B : B \to \mathcal{L}(Y)$, then with these identifications we have the following relations:

$$\phi_B(f,g)(\xi,\eta) = (\phi(f)\xi, \phi(f)\eta) \qquad \text{for } (f,g) \in C_0(F^0) \text{ and } (\xi,\eta) \in C_c(F^1)$$

$$(\xi,\eta)\cdot(f,g) = (\xi\cdot f, \eta\cdot g) \qquad \text{for } (f,g) \in C_0(F^0) \text{ and } (\xi,\eta) \in C_c(F^1)$$

$$\langle(\xi_1,\eta_1),(\xi_2,\eta_2)\rangle_B = (\langle\xi_1,\eta_1\rangle_A, \langle\xi_2,\eta_2\rangle_A) \qquad \text{for } (\xi_1,\eta_1),(\xi_2,\eta_2) \in C_c(F^1)$$

The following lemma is well known, however, since we know of no place where a proof is written down, we provide one here.

Lemma 7.5. *Let X be a second countable locally compact Hausdorff space, let U be an open subset of X, and let $f \in C_0(X)$. Then $f|_U \in C_0(U)$ if and only if $f|_{\text{Bd}(U)} \equiv 0$.*

Proof. Suppose $f|_{\text{Bd}(U)} \equiv 0$. If $\epsilon > 0$ then $\{x \in X : |f(x)| \geq \epsilon\}$ is a compact subset of X, and since $\overline{U}$ is closed, the set $\{x \in \overline{U} : |f(x)| \geq \epsilon\}$ is also compact. Therefore, $f|_{\text{Bd}(U)} \equiv 0$ implies that $\{x \in \overline{U} : |f(x)| \geq \epsilon\} = \{x \in U : |f(x)| \geq \epsilon\}$ is compact. Hence $f|_U \in C_0(U)$.

Conversely, suppose that $f|_{\text{Bd}(U)}$ is not identically zero. Then there exists $x \in \text{Bd}(U)$ such that $f(x) \neq 0$. Let $\epsilon := |f(x)|/2$. Then $C := \{x \in U : |f(x)| \geq \epsilon\}$ is nonempty due to the fact that f is continuous and $x \in \text{Bd}(U)$ is a limit point of U. Since X is a second countable locally compact Hausdorff space it is metrizable. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ let B_n be the closed ball of radius $1/n$ centered at x. Then $\{X\backslash B_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ is an open cover of C. Furthermore, since x is a limit point of U, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists an element which is in both B_n and C. Thus no finite subcover of $\{X\backslash B_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ will cover C. Consequently C is not compact and $f|_U \notin C_0(U)$. ☐

Lemma 7.6. *If $(f,g) \in C_0(F^0_{\text{reg}})$, then $\operatorname{osupp} f \subseteq V \cup W$ and $\operatorname{osupp} g \subseteq V$.*

Proof. Since $(f,g) \in C_0(F^0_{\text{reg}})$ we know that $\phi_B(f,g) \in \mathcal{K}(Y)$. Thus

$$\phi_B(f,g) = \lim_n \sum_{k=1}^{N_n} \Theta^Y_{(\xi_{n,k},\eta_{n,k}),(\nu_{n,k},\zeta_{n,k})}$$

and for any $\xi \in X$ we have

$$(\phi(f)\xi, 0) = \phi_B(f,g)(\xi,0) = \lim_n \sum_{k=1}^{N_n} (\xi_{n,k}\langle\nu_{n,k},\xi\rangle_A, 0)$$

so that $\phi(f) = \lim_n \Theta^X_{\xi_{n,k},\nu_{n,k}} \in \mathcal{K}(X)$ and $\operatorname{osupp} f \subseteq E^0_{\text{fin}}$. Furthermore, if $v \in \overline{E^0_{\text{sinks}}}$, then $(v,0)$ is a sink in F^0. Since $\operatorname{osupp}(f,g) \subseteq F^0_{\text{reg}}$ we have that $\operatorname{osupp}(f,g) \cap \overline{F^0_{\text{sinks}}} = \emptyset$ and consequently $\operatorname{osupp} f \cap \overline{E^0_{\text{sinks}}} = \emptyset$. Thus $\operatorname{osupp} f \subseteq E^0_{\text{fin}} \backslash \overline{E^0_{\text{sinks}}} = E^0_{\text{reg}}$. In addition, since every element of $\{(v,1) : v \in W\}$ is a sink in F, we see that $\{(v,0) : v \in \text{Bd}(W)\} \subseteq \overline{F^0_{\text{sinks}}}$. Because $\operatorname{osupp}(f,g) \subseteq F^0_{\text{reg}} = F^0_{\text{fin}} \backslash \overline{F^0_{\text{sinks}}}$ it follows that $\operatorname{osupp} f \cap \operatorname{Bd} W = \emptyset$. But since $E^0_{\text{reg}} \subseteq V \sqcup W \sqcup \operatorname{Bd} W$ we then have that $\operatorname{osupp} f \subseteq V \cap W$.

In addition, since every element of $\{(v,1) : v \in W\}$ is a sink in F^0, we see that $\operatorname{osupp} g \cap W = \emptyset$. Because $f|_{E^0 \setminus W} = g|_{E^0 \setminus W}$ this implies that $\operatorname{osupp} g \subseteq W$. □

Throughout the rest of this section let X denote the C^*-correspondence over $A = C_0(E^0)$ associated to $\mathcal{Q}$, and let Y denote the C^*-correspondence over $B = C_0(F^0)$ associated to $\mathcal{Q}(V)$. We shall also let $\phi : A \to \mathcal{L}(X)$ denote the left action of A on X, and $\phi_B : B \to \mathcal{L}(Y)$ denote the left action of B on Y.

Definition 7.7. If (ψ, π) is a Toeplitz representation of X in a C^*-algebra D, we define a $*$-homomorphism $\hat{\pi} : B \to D$ by

$$\hat{\pi}(f,g) = \pi(g) + \pi^{(1)}(\phi(f-g)).$$

Remark 7.8. Since $f|_{E^0 \setminus W} = g|_{E^0 \setminus W}$we see that $f - g$ is supported on W and vanishes on $\operatorname{Bd} W$. By Lemma 7.5 it follows that $f - g \in C_0(W) \subseteq C_0(E^0_{\text{reg}})$. Hence $\phi(f-g) \in \mathcal{K}(X)$ and $\pi^{(1)}(\phi(f-g))$ is defined. Furthermore, the relation $\pi(a)\pi^{(1)}(\phi(b)) = \pi^{(1)}(\phi(ab))$ shows that $\hat{\pi}$ is in fact a homomorphism.

Definition 7.9. If (ψ, π) is a Toeplitz representation of X into a C^*-algebra D, then we define a linear map $\Phi : C_c(r^{-1}(W)) \to D$ as follows: If $\zeta \in C_c(r^{-1}(W))$, then $\operatorname{supp} \zeta \subseteq r^{-1}(W)$ so that $\langle \zeta, \eta \rangle_A \in I_W := C_0(W)$ for all $\eta \in X$. By the Hewitt-Cohen Factorization Theorem we have that $X I_W = \{\xi \in X : \langle \xi, \eta \rangle_A \in I_W \text{ for all } \eta \in X\}$ (see [19, Section 2]). Thus $\zeta \in X I_W$ and $\zeta = \nu h$ for some $\nu \in X$ and some $h \in I_W := C_0(r^{-1}(W))$. We then define

$$\Phi(\zeta) := \psi(\nu)\pi^{(1)}(\phi(h)).$$

Lemma 7.10. *The map Φ is well defined and linear.*

Proof. If $\zeta \in C_c(r^{-1}(W))$ with $\zeta = \nu_1 h_1 = \nu_2 h_2$ for $\nu_1, \nu_2 \in X$ and $h_1, h_2 \in I_W := C_0(W)$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Big(\psi(\nu_1)\pi^{(1)}(\phi(h_1)) - \psi(\nu_2)\pi^{(1)}(\phi(h_2))\Big)^* \Big(\psi(\nu_1)\pi^{(1)}(\phi(h_1)) - \psi(\nu_2)\pi^{(1)}(\phi(h_2))\Big) \\
&= \pi^{(1)}(\phi(h_1))^*\psi(\nu_1)^*\psi(\nu_1)\pi^{(1)}(\phi(h_1)) - \pi^{(1)}(\phi(h_2))^*\psi(\nu_2)^*\psi(\nu_1)\pi^{(1)}(\phi(h_1)) \\
&\quad - \pi^{(1)}(\phi(h_1))^*\psi(\nu_1)^*\psi(\nu_2)\pi^{(1)}(\phi(h_2)) + \pi^{(1)}(\phi(h_2))^*\psi(\nu_2)^*\psi(\nu_2)\pi^{(1)}(\phi(h_2)) \\
&= \pi^{(1)}(\phi(\langle \nu_1 h_1, \nu_1 h_1 \rangle_A)) - \pi^{(1)}(\phi(\langle \nu_2 h_2, \nu_1 h_1 \rangle_A)) - \pi^{(1)}(\phi(\langle \nu_1 h_1, \nu_2 h_2 \rangle_A)) \\
&\quad + \pi^{(1)}(\phi(\langle \nu_2 h_2, \nu_2 h_2 \rangle_A)) \\
&= 0
\end{aligned}$$

so the C^*-identity implies that $\psi(\nu_1)\pi^{(1)}(\phi(h_1)) = \psi(\nu_2)\pi^{(1)}(\phi(h_2))$, and Φ is well defined. To see that Φ is linear, let $\zeta_1, \zeta_2 \in C_c(r^{-1}(W))$ and $c \in \mathbb{C}$. Also write $\zeta_1 = \nu_1 h_1$ and $\zeta_2 = \nu_2 h_2$ and $c\zeta_1 + \zeta_2 = \nu h$ for some $\nu_1, \nu_2, \nu \in X$ and some $h_1, h_2, h \in I_W := C_0(W)$. If we let $z := c\psi(\nu_1)\pi^{(1)}(h_1) + \psi(\nu_2)\pi^{(1)}(h_2) - \psi(\nu)\pi^{(1)}(h)$, then an argument as above shows that $z^*z = 0$ and thus $z = 0$ and Φ is linear. □

Definition 7.11. If (ψ, π) is a Toeplitz representation of X in a C^*-algebra D, then we define a linear map $\hat{\psi} : Y \to D$ as follows: for $(\xi, \eta) \in C_c(F^0)$ we set

$$\hat{\psi}(\xi, \eta) := \psi(\eta) + \Phi(\xi - \eta). \tag{7.1}$$

Note that since $\xi|_{E^1\setminus r^{-1}(W)} = \eta|_{E^1\setminus r^{-1}(W)}$ we have that $\xi - \eta$ is supported on $r^{-1}(W)$ and thus $\Phi(\xi-\eta)$ is defined. Since $C_c(F^1)$ is dense in Y we may use (7.1) to extend $\hat{\psi}$ to a linear map $\hat{\psi} : Y \to D$.

Lemma 7.12. *If (ψ,π) is a Toeplitz representation of X into a C^*-algebra D, then $(\hat{\psi},\hat{\pi})$ is a Toeplitz representation of Y into D. Furthermore, if (ψ,π) is coisometric on $C_0(V)$, then $(\hat{\psi},\hat{\pi})$ is coisometric on $C_0(F^0_{\text{reg}})$.*

Proof. In order to show that $(\hat{\psi},\hat{\pi})$ is a Toeplitz representation it suffices to show that (i) and (ii) of Definition 2.3 hold. Let $(f,g) \in C_0(F^1)$ and $(\xi,\eta) \in C_c(F^1)$. If we write $\xi - \eta = \nu h$ for $\nu \in X$ and $h \in C_0(W)$, then we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\pi}(f,g)\hat{\psi}(\xi,\eta) &= (\pi(g) + \pi^{(1)}(\phi(f-g)))(\psi(\eta) + \Phi(\xi-\eta)) \\
&= \pi(g)\psi(\eta) + \pi^{(1)}(\phi(f-g))\psi(\eta) + \pi(g)\psi(\nu)\psi^{(1)}(\phi(h)) \\
&\qquad + \pi^{(1)}(\phi(f-g))\psi(\nu)\pi^{(1)}(\phi(h)) \\
&= \psi(\phi(g)\eta) + \psi(\phi(f-g)\eta) + \psi(\phi(g)\nu)\pi^{(1)}(\phi(h) \\
&\qquad + \psi(\phi(f-g)\nu)\pi^{(1)}(\phi(h) \\
&= \psi(\phi(f)\eta) + \psi(\phi(f)\nu)\pi^{(1)}(\phi(h)) \\
&= \psi(\phi(f)\eta) + \Phi(\phi(f)(\xi-\eta)) \\
&= \hat{\psi}(\phi(f)\xi, \phi(f)\eta) \\
&= \hat{\psi}(\phi_B(f,g)(\xi,\eta)).
\end{aligned}$$

In addition, if $(\xi_1,\eta_1),(\xi_2,\eta_2) \in C_c(F^1)$ and we write $\xi_1 - \eta_1 = \nu_1 h_1$ and $\xi_2 - \eta_2 = \nu_2 h_2$ for $\nu_1,\nu_2 \in X$ and $h_1,h_2 \in C_0(W)$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\psi}(\xi_1,\eta_1)^*\hat{\psi}(\xi_2,\eta_2) &= (\psi(\eta_1) + \Phi(\xi_1-\eta_1))^*(\psi(\eta_2) + \Phi(\xi_2-\eta_2)) \\
&= (\psi(\eta_1) + \psi(\nu_1)\pi^{(1)}(\phi(h_1)))^*(\psi(\eta_2) + \psi(\nu_2)\pi^{(1)}(\phi(h_2))) \\
&= \psi(\eta_1)^*\psi(\eta_2) + \pi^{(1)}(\phi(h_1))^*\psi(\nu_1)^*\psi(\nu_2) \\
&\qquad + \psi(\nu_1)^*\psi(\nu_2)\pi^{(1)}(\phi(h_2)) \\
&\qquad\qquad + \pi^{(1)}(\phi(h_1))^*\psi(\nu_1)^*\psi(\nu_2)\pi^{(1)}(\phi(h_1)) \\
&= \pi(\langle \eta_1,\eta_2\rangle_A) + \pi^{(1)}(\phi(\langle \nu_1 h_1, \nu_2\rangle_A)) + \pi^{(1)}(\phi(\langle \nu_1, \nu_2 h_2\rangle_A)) \\
&\qquad + \pi^{(1)}(\phi(\langle \nu_1 h_1, \nu_2 h_2\rangle_A)) \\
&= \pi(\langle \eta_1,\eta_2\rangle_A) + \pi^{(1)}(\phi(\langle \xi_1,\xi_2\rangle_A - \langle \eta_1,\eta_2\rangle_A)) \\
&= \hat{\pi}(\langle \xi_1,\xi_2\rangle_A, \langle \eta_1,\eta_2\rangle_A) \\
&= \hat{\pi}(\langle (\xi_1,\eta_1),(\xi_2,\eta_2)\rangle_B).
\end{aligned}$$

Since $C_c(F^1)$ is dense in Y, the above two equations show that (i) and (ii) of Definition 2.3 hold, and consequently $(\hat{\psi},\hat{\pi})$ is a Toeplitz representation.

Furthermore, suppose that (ψ,π) is coisometric on $C_0(V)$. If $(f,g) \in C_0(F^0_{\text{reg}})$, then by Lemma 7.6 we have that $\operatorname{osupp} f \subseteq V \cup W$ and $\operatorname{osupp} g \subseteq V$. Thus we may write $(f,g) = (h_V + h_W, h_V)$, where $h_V \in C_0(V)$ and $h_W \in C_0(W)$. If we write

$$\phi(h_V + h_W) = \lim_n \sum_{k=1}^{N_n} \Theta^X_{\xi_{n,k},\eta_{n,k}},$$

then

$$\phi_B(h_V + h_W, h_V) = \lim_n \sum_{k=1}^{N_n} \Theta^Y_{(\xi_{n,k},\xi_{n,k}),(\eta_{n,k},\eta_{n,k})}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\pi}^{(1)}(\phi_B(f,g)) = \hat{\pi}^{(1)} &= \hat{\pi}^{(1)}(\phi_B(h_V + h_W, h_V)) \\ &= \lim_n \sum_{k=1}^{N_n} \hat{\psi}(\xi_{n,k},\xi_{n,k}), \hat{\psi}(\eta_{n,k},\eta_{n,k})^* \\ &= \lim_n \sum_{k=1}^{N_n} \psi(\xi_{n,k})\psi(\eta_{n,k})^* \\ &= \pi^{(1)}(\phi(h_V + h_W)) \\ &= \pi(h_V) + \pi^{(1)}(\phi(h_W)) \\ &= \hat{\pi}(h_V + h_W, h_V) \\ &= \hat{\pi}(f,g)\end{aligned}$$

so $(\hat{\psi}, \hat{\pi})$ is coisometric on $C_0(F^0_{\text{reg}})$. □

Theorem 7.13. *Let $\mathcal{Q} = (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ be a topological quiver and let V be an open subset of E^0_{reg}. Also let X denote the C^*-correspondence over $A = C_0(E^0)$ associated to $\mathcal{Q}$, and let Y denote the C^*-correspondence over $B = C_0(F^0)$ associated to $\mathcal{Q}(V)$.*

Let (ψ, π) be an injective Toeplitz representation of X into a C^*-algebra D which is coisometric on $C_0(V)$ and has the property that whenever $f \in C_0(E^0_{\text{fin}})$ and $\pi(f) = \pi^{(1)}(\phi(f))$, then $f \in C_0(V)$. Then $(\hat{\psi}, \hat{\pi})$ is an injective Toeplitz representation of Y into D which is coisometric on $C_0(F^0_{\text{reg}})$.

Proof. It follows from Lemma 7.12 that $(\hat{\psi}, \hat{\pi})$ is a Toeplitz representation which is coisometric on $C_0(F^0_{\text{reg}})$. To see that $(\hat{\psi}, \hat{\pi})$ is injective, let $(f,g) \in C_0(F^0)$ with $\hat{\pi}(f,g) = 0$. Then $\pi(g) = \pi^{(1)}(\phi(g - f))$, and by Lemma 2.10 we have that $\phi(g) \in \mathcal{K}(X)$ and $\pi(g) = \pi^{(1)}(\phi(g))$. It then follows from the hypothesis of this lemma that $g \in C_0(V)$. Since $f|_{E^0 \setminus W} = g|_{E^0 \setminus W}$ we must have $f = g + h$ where $h \in C_0(W)$. But then the fact that $\pi(g) = \pi^{(1)}(\phi(g - f))$ implies that $\pi^{(1)}(\phi(g)) = \pi^{(1)}(\phi(h))$ and by Lemma 2.11 we have that $g = h$. Since $V \cap W = \emptyset$ this implies that $g = h = 0$. Thus $f = g + h = 0$ and $(f,g) = 0$ so that $\hat{\pi}$ is injective. □

Corollary 7.14. *If (ψ, π) is a universal Toeplitz representation of X in $\mathcal{O}(C_0(V), X)$ which is coisometric on $C_0(V)$, then the induced homomorphism $\rho_{(\hat{\psi},\hat{\pi})} : C^*(\mathcal{Q}(V)) \to \mathcal{O}(C_0(V), X)$ is an isomorphism.*

Proof. Let $(\psi_{\mathcal{Q}}, \pi_{\mathcal{Q}})$ denote the universal representation of X in $C^*(\mathcal{Q})$ which is coisometric on $C_0(E^0_{\text{reg}})$. Since $(\psi_{\mathcal{Q}}, \pi_{\mathcal{Q}})$ is also coisometric on $C_0(V)$, there exists a homomorphism $\rho_{(\psi_{\mathcal{Q}},\pi_{\mathcal{Q}})} : \mathcal{O}(C_0(V), X) \to C^*(\mathcal{Q})$ with $\rho_{(\psi_{\mathcal{Q}},\pi_{\mathcal{Q}})} \circ \pi = \pi_{\mathcal{Q}}$. Because $\pi_{\mathcal{Q}}$ is injective by Corollary 4.5, it follows that π must also be injective. Thus (ψ, π) is an injective Toeplitz representation. Furthermore, it follows from Lemma 2.9 that if $f \in C_0(E^0_{\text{fin}})$ and $\pi(f) = \pi^{(1)}(\phi(f))$, then $f \in C_0(V)$. Thus Theorem 7.13 shows that $(\hat{\psi}, \hat{\pi})$ is an injective Toeplitz representation which is coisometric on $C_0(F^0_{\text{reg}})$.

Because the induced map $\rho_{(\hat{\psi},\hat{\pi})} : C^*(\mathcal{Q}(V)) \to \mathcal{O}(C_0(V), X)$ intertwines the gauge actions on $C^*(\mathcal{Q}(V))$ and $\mathcal{O}(C_0(V), X)$ (simply check on the generators $\psi_{\mathcal{Q}(V)}(Y) \cup \pi_{\mathcal{Q}(V)}(B)$), it follows from Theorem 4.7 that $\rho_{(\hat{\psi},\hat{\pi})}$ is injective.

Finally, $\rho_{(\hat{\psi},\hat{\pi})}$ is surjective since for any $f \in A$ we have $\rho_{(\hat{\psi},\hat{\pi})}(\pi_{Q(V)}(f,f)) = \hat{\pi}(f,f) = \pi(f)$, and for any $\xi \in C_c(E^1)$ we have $\rho_{(\hat{\psi},\hat{\pi})}(\psi_{Q(V)}(\xi,\xi)) = \hat{\psi}(\xi,\xi) = \psi(\xi)$. Thus $\rho_{(\hat{\psi},\hat{\pi})}$ is an isomorphism. □

Corollary 7.15. *If (ψ, π) is a universal Toeplitz representation of X in $\mathcal{O}(C_0(V), X)$ which is coisometric on $C_0(V)$, and $\rho : \mathcal{O}(C_0(V), X) \to D$ is a $*$-homomorphism between C^*-algebras that satisfies the following three conditions:*

1. *the restriction $\rho|_{\pi(A)}$ is injective*
2. *the restriction $\rho|_{(\pi-\pi^{(1)}\circ\phi)(C_0(E^0_{\mathrm{reg}}))}$ is injective*
3. *there exists a strongly continuous gauge action $\beta : \mathbb{T} \to \operatorname{Aut} \operatorname{im} \rho$ with $\beta_z \circ \rho = \rho\gamma_z$ for all $z \in \mathbb{T}$*

then ρ is injective.

Proof. If we define $(\psi_0, \pi_0) = (\rho \circ \psi, \rho \circ \pi)$, then (ψ_0, π_0) is a Toeplitz representation of X into D which is coisometric on $C_0(V)$. Condition (1) shows that (ψ_0, π_0) is injective, and Condition (2) shows that whenever $f \in C_0(E^0_{\mathrm{reg}})$ and $\pi(f) = \pi^{(1)}(\phi(f))$, then $f \in C_0(V)$. Thus by Theorem 7.13 we see that $(\hat{\psi}_0, \hat{\pi}_0)$ is an injective Toeplitz representation of Y in D which is coisometric on $C_0(F^0_{\mathrm{reg}})$. Consequently, it induces a homomorphism $\rho_{(\hat{\psi}_0,\hat{\pi}_0)} : C^*(\mathcal{Q}(V)) \to D$ whose restriction to $\hat{\pi}_0(B)$ is injective. This, combined with Condition (3), allows us to apply Theorem 4.7 and conclude that $\rho_{(\hat{\psi}_0,\hat{\pi}_0)}$ is injective. Since $\hat{\psi}_0 = \rho \circ \hat{\psi}$ and $\hat{\pi}_0 = \rho \circ \hat{\pi}$ we see that $\rho_{(\hat{\psi}_0,\hat{\pi}_0)} = \rho \circ \rho_{(\hat{\psi},\hat{\pi})}$. From Corollary 7.14 we know that $\rho_{(\hat{\psi},\hat{\pi})}$ is an isomorphism and thus ρ is injective. □

Corollary 7.16. *If $\mathcal{Q}$ satisfies Condition (L) and $\rho : \mathcal{O}(C_0(V), X) \to D$ is a homomorphism between C^*-algebras that satisfies the following two conditions:*

1. *the restriction $\rho|_{\pi(A)}$ is injective*
2. *the restriction $\rho|_{(\pi-\pi^{(1)}\circ\phi)(C_0(E^0_{\mathrm{reg}}))}$ is injective*

then ρ is injective.

Proof. In forming $\mathcal{Q}(V)$ we see that all of the elements in the added copy of W are sinks, and thus no loop in $\mathcal{Q}(V)$ is based at elements in the added copy of W. Thus the fact that $\mathcal{Q}$ satisfies Condition (L) implies that $\mathcal{Q}(V)$ satisfies Condition (L). In addition, as in Corollary 7.15 we see that $(\psi_0, \pi_0) = (\rho \circ \psi, \rho \circ \pi)$ is a Toeplitz representation of X in D which is coisometric on $C_0(F^0_{\mathrm{reg}})$, and Conditions (1) and (2) show that the hypotheses of Theorem 7.13 are satisfied. Thus $(\hat{\psi}_0, \hat{\pi}_0)$ is an injective Toeplitz representation of Y in D which is coisometric on $C_0(F^0_{\mathrm{reg}})$, and by Theorem 6.16 we have that $\rho_{(\hat{\psi}_0,\hat{\pi}_0)}$ is injective. Since $\rho_{(\hat{\psi}_0,\hat{\pi}_0)} = \rho \circ \rho_{(\hat{\psi},\hat{\pi})}$ and Corollary 7.14 shows that $\rho_{(\hat{\psi},\hat{\pi})}$ is an isomorphism we have that ρ is injective. □

8. Gauge-Invariant Ideals and Quotients

In this section we use Theorem 4.7 to characterize the gauge-invariant ideals in C^*-algebras associated to topological quivers, and to identify quotients of quiver algebras by these ideals.

Definition 8.1. Let X be a C^*-correspondence over A. We say that an ideal I in A is *X-invariant* if $\phi(I)X \subseteq XI$. We say that an X-invariant ideal I in A is *X-saturated* if

$$a \in J_X \text{ and } \phi(a)X \subseteq XI \implies a \in I.$$

Recall that if I is an ideal of A, then

$$X_I := \{x \in X : \langle x, y\rangle_A \in I \text{ for all } y \in X\}$$

is a right Hilbert A-module, and by the Hewitt-Cohen Factorization Theorem we have $X_I = XI := \{x \cdot i : x \in X \text{ and } i \in I\}$ (see [19, §2]). Furthermore, X/XI is a right Hilbert A/I-module in the obvious way [19, Lemma 2.1]. In order for X/XI to be a C^*-correspondence, we need the ideal I to be X-invariant. Let $q^I : A \to A/I$ and $q^{XI} : X \to X/XI$ be the appropriate quotient maps. If I is X-invariant, then one may define $\phi_{A/I} : A/I \to \mathcal{L}(X/XI)$ by

$$\phi_{A/I}(q^I(a))(q^{XI}(x)) := q^{XI}(\phi(a)(x))$$

and with this action X/XI is a C^*-correspondence over A/I [19, Lemma 3.2].

Lemma 8.2. *Let X be a C^*-correspondence over a C^*-algebra A, and let I be an X-saturated X-invariant ideal in A. If $q^I : A \to A/I$ denotes the quotient map, then*

$$q^I(J_X) \subseteq J_{X/XI}.$$

Furthermore, if X has the following two properties:

1. $\phi(A) \subseteq \mathcal{K}(X)$
2. $\ker\phi$ *is complemented in A (i.e. there exists an ideal J of A with the property that $A = J \oplus \ker\phi$),*

then

$$q^I(J_X) = J_{X/XI}.$$

Proof. Let $a \in J_X$. Then $a \in J(X)$, and it follows from [19, Lemma 2.7] that $q^I(a) \in J(X/XI)$. Also, if $q^I(b) \in \ker\phi_{A/I}$, then $q^I(ab) \in \ker\phi_{A/I}$ and for all $x \in X$ we have

$$q^{XI}(\phi(ab)(x)) = \phi_{A/I}(ab)q^{XI}(x) = 0$$

and thus

$$\phi(ab)XI \subseteq XI. \tag{8.1}$$

Since $a \in J_X$ and J_X is an ideal, we see that $ab \in J_X$. Furthermore, because I is X-saturated, (8.1) implies that $ab \in I$ and $q^I(a)q^I(b) = q^I(ab) = 0$. Thus $q^I(a) \in (\ker\phi_{A/I})^\perp$ and $q^I(a) \in J_{X/XI}$.

Now suppose that Conditions (1) and (2) in the statement of the lemma hold. Since $\phi(A) \subseteq \mathcal{K}(X)$ it follows that $J(X) = A$. In addition, [19, Lemma 2.7] shows that $q^I(J(X)) = J(X/XI)$. From Condition (2) we know that $A = J \oplus \ker\phi$ for some ideal J of A. However, the definition of J_X then implies that $J = J_X$. Thus if $a \in A$ and $q^I(a) \in J_{X/XI}$, then we may write $a = b + c$ for $b \in J_X$ and $c \in \ker\phi$. But then $q^I(b) \in J_{X/XI}$ by the first part of the lemma, and $q^I(c) = q^I(a) - q^I(b) \in J_{X/XI}$. Since $c \in \ker\phi$ it follows that for all $x \in X$ we have

$$\phi_{A/I}(q^I(c))q^{XI}(x) = q^{XI}(\phi(c)(x)) = 0$$

and thus $q^I(c) \in \ker\phi_{A/I}$. Consequently $q^I(c) \in J_{X/XI} \cap \ker\phi_{A/I} = \{0\}$ so $q^I(c) = 0$ and $q^I(a) = q^I(b) \in q^I(J_X)$. Hence $J_{X/XI} \subseteq q^I(J_X)$. □

We shall see in Example 8.14 and Example 8.15 that both Property (1) and Property (2) are necessary in Lemma 8.2.

Definition 8.3. Let $\mathcal{Q} = (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ be a topological quiver. We say that a subset $U \subseteq E^0$ is *hereditary* if whenever $\alpha \in E^1$ and $s(\alpha) \in U$, then $r(\alpha) \in U$. We say that a hereditary subset U is *saturated* if whenever $v \in E^0_{\text{reg}}$ and $r(s^{-1}(v)) \subseteq U$, then $v \in U$.

Lemma 8.4. *Let $\mathcal{Q} = (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ be a topological quiver. An open subset $U \subseteq E^0$ is saturated if and only if whenever V is an open subset of E^0_{reg} and $r(s^{-1}(V)) \subseteq U$, then $V \subseteq U$.*

Proof. Clearly if U is saturated, then it has the above property. Conversely, suppose that U has the property that whenever V is an open subset of E^0_{reg} with $r(s^{-1}(V)) \subseteq U$, then $V \subseteq U$. We shall show that U is saturated by showing that whenever $v \in E^0_{\text{reg}} \backslash U$, then there exists $\alpha \in E^1$ with $s(\alpha) = v$ and $r(\alpha) \notin U$. To this end, let $v \in E^0_{\text{reg}} \backslash U$. Since $v \in E^0_{\text{reg}}$ we know that there exists a neighborhood V of v such that $s^{-1}(\overline{V})$ is compact and $r|_{s^{-1}(V)}$ is a local homeomorphism, and furthermore that $v \in \overline{s(E^1)}$. Now since $v \notin U$ it follows from our hypothesis that for every neighborhood W of v there exists a $\beta \in s^{-1}(W)$ with $r(\beta) \notin U$. Thus we may choose a sequence of edges $\{\alpha_n\}_{n=1}^\infty \subseteq s^{-1}(V)$ with $r(\alpha_n) \notin U$ for all n, and with $\lim_{n \to \infty} s(\alpha_n) = v$. Furthermore, since $\{\alpha_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ is contained in the compact subset $s^{-1}(\overline{V})$ we may (after possibly passing to a subsequence) assume that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \alpha_n$ exists. If we let $\alpha := \lim_{n\to\infty} \alpha_n$, then we see that $s(\alpha) = \lim_{n\to\infty} s(\alpha_n) = v$. In addition, since $r(\alpha_n) \notin U$ for all n, the fact that U is open implies that $r(\alpha) = \lim_n r(\alpha_n) \notin U$. $\square$

Lemma 8.5. *Let $\mathcal{Q} = (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ be a topological quiver and let X be the C^*-correspondence associated to $\mathcal{Q}$. If I is an ideal in $C_0(E^0)$, then $I = C_0(U)$ for an open subset $U \subseteq E^0$ and*

1. *I is X-invariant if and only if U is hereditary.*
2. *I is X-saturated if and only if U is saturated.*

Proof. Certainly I has the form $C_0(U)$ by general theory. To see (1) suppose first that I is X-invariant. If $\alpha \in E^1$ and $s(\alpha) \in U$, choose $f \in C_0(U)$ with $f(s(\alpha)) \neq 0$. Also choose $\xi \in C_c(E^1)$ with $\xi(\alpha) \neq 0$. Since I is X-invariant $\phi(f)\xi = \eta g$ for some $\eta \in X$ and $g \in I = C_0(E^0)$. Now

$$\eta(\alpha) g(r(\alpha)) = (\eta g)(\alpha) = (\phi(f)\xi)(\alpha) = f(s(\alpha))\xi(\alpha) \neq 0$$

so $g(r(\alpha) \neq 0$ and consequently $r(\alpha) \in U$. Thus U is hereditary.

Conversely, suppose that U is hereditary. If $f \in C_0(U)$ and $\xi, \eta \in C_c(E^1)$, then for any $v \notin U$ we have

$$\langle \phi(f)\xi, \eta \rangle_A(v) = \int_{r^{-1}(v)} \overline{f(s(\alpha))\xi(\alpha)} \eta(\alpha) \, d\lambda_v(\alpha) = 0$$

since $s(\alpha) \notin U$ whenever $r(\alpha) = v$. Thus $\langle \phi(f)\xi, \eta \rangle_A \in I = C_0(U)$ and since $C_c(E^1)$ is dense in X this shows that $\phi(f)X \in X_I = XI$ and $I = C_0(U)$ is X-invariant.

To see (2) suppose first that $I = C_0(U)$ is X-saturated. Let V be an open subset of E^0_{reg} with $r(s^{-1}(V)) \subseteq U$. Choose any $v \in V$ and let $f \in C_c(V)$ with $f(v) = 1$.

Then $f \in C_0(E^0_{\mathrm{reg}})$ and for all $\xi\eta \in C_c(E^1)$ we see that when $w \in U$ we have

$$\langle \phi(f)\xi, \eta\rangle_A(w) = \int_{r^{-1}(w)} \overline{f(s(\alpha))\xi(\alpha)}\eta(\alpha)\, d\lambda_w(\alpha) = 0$$

since whenever $s(\alpha) \in V$ we must have $r(\alpha) \notin U$ and thus $r(\alpha) \neq w$. This shows that $\langle \phi(f)\xi, \eta\rangle_A \in I = C_0(U)$ and since $C_c(E^1)$ is dense in X, it follows that $\phi(f)I \subseteq X_I = XI$. Because I is X-saturated this implies that $f \in I = C_0(U)$, and consequently $v \in \operatorname{supp} f \subseteq U$. Hence $V \subseteq U$ and by Lemma 8.4 it follows that U is saturated.

Conversely, suppose that U is saturated. Let $f \in C_0(E^0_{\mathrm{reg}})$ with $\phi(f)X \subseteq XI$. Also let $V := \operatorname{osupp} f \subseteq E^0_{\mathrm{reg}}$. Then it follows that $\phi(f)X \subseteq X_I = XI$ and $\langle \phi(f)\xi, \xi)\rangle_A \in I = C_0(U)$ for all $\xi \in C_c(E^1)$. Hence whenever $w \notin U$ we have

$$\int_{r^{-1}(w)} \overline{f(s(\alpha))} |\xi(\alpha)|^2 d\lambda_w(\alpha) = \langle \phi(f)\xi, \xi\rangle_A(w) = 0$$

for all $\xi \in C_c(E^1)$. But this implies that $f(s(\alpha)) = 0$ for all $\alpha \in r^{-1}(w)$. Hence $w \notin r(s^{-1}(V))$ and $r(s^{-1}(V)) \subseteq U$. By Lemma 8.4 it follows that $V \subseteq U$ and $f \in C_0(U)$. Hence $I = C_0(U)$ is X-saturated. □

Lemma 8.6. *Let X be a C^*-correspondence over a C^*-algebra A, and let (ψ, π) be a Toeplitz representation of X into a C^*-algebra B which is coisometric on J_X. If I is an ideal in B, $a \in J_X$, and*

$$\psi(x)^*\pi(a)\psi(y) \in I \qquad \text{for all } x, y \in X$$

then $\pi(a) \in I$.

Proof. Note that $\pi^{(1)}(\mathcal{K}(X)) = \overline{\operatorname{span}}\{\psi(x)\psi(y)^* : x, y \in X\}$, so we may choose an approximate unit $\{e_\lambda\}_{\lambda\in\Lambda}$ for $\pi^{(1)}(\mathcal{K}(X))$ with each e_λ of the form $\sum_{k=1}^{N_\lambda} \psi(x_k^\lambda)\psi(y_k^\lambda)^*$. But then $e_\lambda \pi(a) e_\lambda \in I$ and since $a \in J_X$ we see that $\pi(a) = \pi^{(1)}(\phi(a)) \in \pi^{(1)}(\mathcal{K}(X))$. Taking limits then shows that $\pi(a) \in I$. □

Lemma 8.7. *Let $\mathcal{Q} = (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ be a topological quiver, let X be the C^*-correspondence associated to $\mathcal{Q}$, and let $(\psi_{\mathcal{Q}}, \pi_{\mathcal{Q}})$ be a universal Toeplitz representation of X in $C^*(\mathcal{Q})$ which is coisometric on $C_0(E^0_{\mathrm{reg}})$. If $\mathcal{I}$ is an ideal in $C^*(\mathcal{Q})$, then $\pi_{\mathcal{Q}}^{-1}(\mathcal{I})$ is an X-saturated X-invariant ideal in $A := C_0(E^0)$.*

Proof. Clearly $I := \pi_{\mathcal{Q}}^{-1}(\mathcal{I})$ is an ideal in $A = C_0(E^0)$. To see that I is X-invariant, let $f \in I$. Then for all $\xi, \eta \in C_c(E^1)$ we have

$$\pi_{\mathcal{Q}}(\langle \phi(f)\xi, \eta\rangle_A) = \psi_{\mathcal{Q}}(\phi(f)\xi)^*\psi_{\mathcal{Q}}(\eta) = \psi_{\mathcal{Q}}(\xi)\pi_{\mathcal{Q}}(f)^*\psi_{\mathcal{Q}}(\eta) \in \mathcal{I}.$$

Thus $\langle \phi(f)\xi, \eta\rangle_A \in I$ for all $\xi, \eta \in C_c(E^1)$. Since $C_c(E^1)$ is dense in X this shows that $\langle \phi(f)x, y\rangle_A \in I$ for all $x, y \in X$. Thus $\phi(f)X \subseteq X_I = XI$ and I is X-invariant.

In addition, if $f \in C_0(E^0_{\mathrm{reg}})$ and $\phi(f)X \subseteq XI$, then for all $x \in X$ we have $\phi(f)x \in XI = X_I$ so that $\langle \phi(f)x, y\rangle_A \in I$ for all $x, y \in X$. But then for all $x, y \in X$ we have

$$\psi_{\mathcal{Q}}(x)^*\pi_{\mathcal{Q}}(f)^*\psi_{\mathcal{Q}}(y) = \pi_{\mathcal{Q}}(\langle \phi(f)x, y\rangle_A) \in \mathcal{I}$$

and by Lemma 8.6 we have that $\pi_{\mathcal{Q}}(f)^* \in \mathcal{I}$ and thus $\pi_{\mathcal{Q}}(f) \in \mathcal{I}$. It follows that $f \in I$ and I is X-saturated. □

Definition 8.8. Let $\mathcal{Q} = (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ be a topological quiver. If U is a hereditary open subset of E^0 we define a topological quiver $\mathcal{Q}_U := (E^0_U, E^1_U, r_U, s_U, \lambda^U)$ by

$$E^0_U := E^0 \backslash U \qquad E^1_U := E^1 \backslash r^{-1}(U)$$

$$r_U := r|_{E^1_U} \qquad s_U := s|_{E^1_U} \qquad \lambda^U := \lambda|_{E^0 \backslash U}.$$

It is straightforward to verify that $\mathcal{Q}_U$ is a topological quiver.

Remark 8.9. Let $\mathcal{Q} = (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ be a topological quiver and let X be the C^*-correspondence over $A := C_0(E^0)$ associated to $\mathcal{Q}$. If U is a hereditary open subset of E^0, then $I_U := C_0(U)$ is an X-invariant ideal in A and X/XI_U is a right Hilbert A/I_U-module. Furthermore, if U is also saturated, then I_U is X-saturated and X/XI_U is a C^*-correspondence over $A/I_U \cong C_0(E^0_U)$, and we see that X/XI_U is the C^*-correspondence associated to $\mathcal{Q}_U$.

Definition 8.10. Let $\mathcal{Q} = (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ be a topological quiver, let U be a hereditary open subset of E^0, and let V be an open subset of $(E^0_U)_{\text{reg}}$. Then we define $\mathcal{Q}_{(U,V)} := \mathcal{Q}_U(V)$; that is, $\mathcal{Q}_{(U,V)}$ is obtained by first forming the quiver $\mathcal{Q}_U$ from $\mathcal{Q}$ as described in Definition 8.8 and then forming the quiver $\mathcal{Q}_U(V)$ from $\mathcal{Q}_U$ as described in Definition 7.2.

Lemma 8.11. *Let $\mathcal{Q} = (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ be a topological quiver, and let X be the C^*-correspondence over $A = C_0(E^0)$ associated to $\mathcal{Q}$. If $\phi(A) \subseteq \mathcal{K}(X)$, then the following are equivalent:*

1. $\ker \phi$ *is complemented in A (i.e., there is an ideal J in A such that $A = J \oplus \ker \phi$)*
2. $A = J_X \oplus \ker \phi$
3. $\overline{s(E^1)}$ *is a clopen subset of E^0.*

Proof. Suppose (1) holds. Then $A = J \oplus \ker \phi$ for some ideal J in A. Since $\phi(A) \subseteq \mathcal{K}(X)$ we see that $J(X) = A$ and J is the largest ideal of $J(X)$ which annihilates $\ker \phi$. Thus $J = J_X$ and (2) holds.

If (2) holds, then $C_0(E^0) = C_0(E^0_{\text{reg}}) \oplus C_0(E^0_{\text{sinks}})$ and thus E^0 is the disjoint union of E^0_{reg} and E^0_{sinks}. Since E^0_{reg} is open this implies that E^0_{sinks} is closed, and because $E^0_{\text{sinks}} = E^0 \backslash \overline{s(E^1)}$ we see that $\overline{s(E^1)}$ is open (and hence clopen) so that (3) holds.

If (3) holds, then $\overline{s(E^1)}$ is clopen and $E^0_{\text{sinks}} = E^0 \backslash \overline{s(E^1)}$ is clopen. Also since $\phi(A) \subseteq \mathcal{K}(X)$ we have that $E^0_{\text{fin}} = E^0$, and $E^0_{\text{reg}} = E^0_{\text{fin}} \backslash \overline{E^0_{\text{sinks}}} = E^0 \backslash E^0_{\text{sinks}}$ is open. Thus E^0 is the disjoint union of the open sets E^0_{reg} and E^0_{sinks}. Hence

$$A = C_0(E^0) = C_0(E^0_{\text{reg}}) \oplus C_0(E^0_{\text{sinks}}) = C_0(E^0_{\text{reg}}) \oplus \ker \phi$$

and (1) holds. □

Lemma 8.12. *Let $\mathcal{Q} = (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ be a topological quiver and let U be a saturated hereditary open subset of E^0. Then*

$$E^0_{\text{reg}} \backslash U \subseteq (E^0_U)_{\text{reg}}.$$

Furthermore, if $E^0_{\text{fin}} = E^0$ and $\overline{s(E^1)}$ is a clopen subset of E^0, then $E^0_{\text{reg}} \backslash U = (E^0_U)_{\text{reg}}$.

Proof. Let X denote the C^*-correspondence over $A := C_0(E^0)$ associated to $\mathcal{Q}$. If we define $I := C_0(U)$, then Lemma 8.5 shows that I is an X-saturated X-invariant ideal in A. Since $q^I(J_X) = q^I(C_0(E^0_{\mathrm{reg}})) = C_0(E^0_{\mathrm{reg}})$ and $J_{X/XI} = C_0((E^0_U)_{\mathrm{reg}})$ the result follows from Lemma 8.2 and Lemma 8.11. ☐

Remark 8.13. Let $\mathcal{Q} = (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ be a topological quiver, and let X be the C^*-correspondence over $A = C_0(E^0)$ associated to $\mathcal{Q}$. If $\phi(A) \subseteq \mathcal{K}(X)$ and $\overline{s(E^1)}$ is a clopen subset of E^0, then it follows from Lemma 8.2 and Lemma 8.11 that whenever I is an X-saturated X-invariant ideal in A, one has that $q^I(J_X) = J_{X/XI}$.

The following two examples show that if we remove either the condition that $\phi(A) \subseteq \mathcal{K}(X)$ or the condition that $\ker \phi$ is complemented in A, then the containment $q^I(J_X) \subseteq J_{X/XI}$ may be strict.

Example 8.14. Let E be the graph

$$v \xRightarrow{\infty} w$$

which contains two vertices, v and w, and a countably infinite number of edges from v to w. Then $\ker \phi$ is complemented in $A = C_0(E^0)$ (since E^0 has the discrete topology), but $\phi(A) \nsubseteq \mathcal{K}(X)$ (since E is not row-finite, see [20, Proposition 4.4]). Since $\{w\}$ is a saturated hereditary subset, we see that $I_w := \mathbb{C} \cdot \delta_w$ is an X-saturated X-invariant ideal in A. But the quotient $C^*(E)/I_w$ is isomorphic to the C^*-algebra of the graph consisting of the single vertex w (see [4, Proposition 3.4]). Thus we see that $J_{X/XI_w} = \mathbb{C} \cdot \delta_v$, but $q^{I_w}(J_X) = q^{I_w}(I_w) = 0$ so $q^{I_w}(J_X) \subsetneq J_{X/XI_w}$.

Example 8.15. Let $E^0 := \{0\} \cup [1,2]$, $E^1 := \{\alpha\}$, $s : E^1 \to E^0$ given by $s(\alpha) = 1$, $r : E^1 \to E^0$ given by $r(\alpha) = 0$, and λ given by counting measure. Then $\mathcal{Q} = (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ is a topological quiver, and $E^0_{\mathrm{fin}} = E^0$ so $\phi(A) \subseteq \mathcal{K}(X)$, but $\overline{s(E^1)} = \overline{\{1\}} = \{1\}$ is not open, and consequently $\ker \phi$ is not complemented in $A = C_0(E^0)$.

Furthermore, we see that $E^0_{\mathrm{sinks}} = E^0 \backslash \overline{s(E^1)} = \{0\} \cup (1,2]$, and that $E^0_{\mathrm{reg}} = E^0_{\mathrm{fin}} \backslash \overline{E^0_{\mathrm{sinks}}} = \emptyset$. In addition, $U = (1,2]$ is a saturated hereditary open subset of E^0 and $\mathcal{Q}_U$ is the topological quiver (or in this case directed graph) given by

$$0 \xleftarrow{\alpha} 1$$

so that $(E^0_U)_{\mathrm{reg}} = \{1\}$. But then if we let $I := C_0(U)$ we see that $q^I(J_X) = q^I(C_0(E^0_{\mathrm{reg}})) = 0$ and $J_{X/XI} = C_0((E^0_U)_{\mathrm{reg}}) = \mathbb{C}$ so that $q^I(J_X) \subsetneq J_{X/XI}$.

Definition 8.16. Let $\mathcal{Q} = (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ be a topological quiver. We say that (U, V) is an *admissible pair* of $\mathcal{Q}$ if the following two conditions are satisfied:

1. U is a saturated hereditary open subset of E^0
2. V is an open subset of E^0_U with $E^0_{\mathrm{reg}} \backslash U \subseteq V \subseteq (E^0_U)_{\mathrm{reg}}$.

Definition 8.17. Let $\mathcal{Q} = (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ be a topological quiver, let U be an open hereditary subset of E^0, and let V be an open subset of $(E^0_U)_{\mathrm{reg}}$. If $I := C_0(U)$ and $(\psi_{X/XI}, \pi_{X/XI})$ is the universal Toeplitz representation of X/XI in $\mathcal{O}(C_0(V), X/XI)$ which is coisometric on $C_0(V)$, then we define a map $T_{U,V} : J(X/XI) \to \mathcal{O}(C_0(V), X/XI)$ by

$$T_{U,V}(q^I(f)) := \pi_{A/I}(q^I(f)) - \pi^{(1)}_{A/I}(\phi_{A/I}(q^I(f))).$$

The map defined in Definition 8.17 is a special instance of the map defined in [41, p.20], and as shown there it is a homomorphism.

Lemma 8.18. *Let $\mathcal{Q} = (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ be a topological quiver and let X be the C^*-correspondence associated to $\mathcal{Q}$. If (U, V) is an admissible pair for $\mathcal{Q}$, let $I := C_0(U)$ and let $(\psi_{X/XI}, \pi_{A/I})$ be a universal Toeplitz representation of X/XI into $\mathcal{O}(C_0(V), X/XI)$ which is coisometric on $C_0(V)$. Then there exists a homomorphism $h_{U,V} : C^*(\mathcal{Q}) \to \mathcal{O}(C_0(V), X/XI)$ that makes the following diagram commute*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X \arrow[rr, "q^{XI}"] \arrow[dr, swap, "\psi_{\mathcal{Q}}"] & & X/XI \arrow[dr, "\psi_{X/XI}"] & \\
& C^*(\mathcal{Q}) \arrow[rr, dotted, "h_{U,V}"] & & \mathcal{O}(C_0(V), X/XI) \\
A \arrow[rr, "q^I"] \arrow[ur, "\pi_{\mathcal{Q}}"] & & A/I \arrow[ur, swap, "\pi_{A/I}"] &
\end{tikzcd}$$

Proof. It suffices to prove that the Toeplitz representation $(\psi, \pi) := (\psi_{X/XI} \circ q^{XI}, \pi_{A/I} \circ q^I)$ is coisometric on $C_0(E^0_{\text{reg}})$. Since $E^0_{\text{reg}} \backslash U \subseteq V$ it follows that $q^I(C_0(E^0_{\text{reg}})) \subseteq C_0(V)$, and thus by [19, Lemma 2.9(2)] we have that (ψ, π) is coisometric on $C_0(E^0_{\text{reg}})$. □

Definition 8.19. Let $\mathcal{Q} = (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ be a topological quiver and let (U, V) be an admissible pair for $\mathcal{Q}$. We define an ideal $\mathcal{I}_{(U,V)}$ in $C^*(\mathcal{Q})$ by

$$\mathcal{I}_{(U,V)} := \text{the ideal in } C^*(\mathcal{Q}) \text{ generated by } \pi_{\mathcal{Q}}(C_0(U)) \cup h^{-1}_{U,V}(T_{U,V}(C_0(V))).$$

Lemma 8.20. *Let $\mathcal{Q} = (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ be a topological quiver and let X be the C^*-correspondence associated to $\mathcal{Q}$. If (U, V) is an admissible pair for $\mathcal{Q}$, then* $\ker h_{U,V} = \mathcal{I}_{(U,V)}$. *Furthermore, if we let $I := C_0(U)$, then $C^*(\mathcal{Q})/\mathcal{I}_{(U,V)} \cong \mathcal{O}(C_0(V), X/XI)$.*

Proof. Let $(\psi_{X/XI}, \pi_{A/I})$ be a universal Toeplitz representation of X/XI into $\mathcal{O}(C_0(V), X/XI)$ which is coisometric on $C_0(V)$. As in the proof of Lemma 8.18 we see that $(\psi, \pi) := (\psi_{X/XI} \circ q^{XI}, \pi_{A/I} \circ q^I)$ is a Toeplitz representation which is coisometric on $C_0(E^0_{\text{reg}})$, and $h_{U,V}$ is equal to the induced homomorphism $\rho_{(\psi,\pi)}$. Now for all $f \in C_0(U)$ we have

$$h_{U,V}(\pi_{\mathcal{Q}}(f)) = \pi(f) = \pi_{A/I}(q^I(f)) = 0$$

and for all $f \in C_0(V)$ we have

$$h_{U,V}(h^{-1}_{U,V}(T_{U,V}(f))) = T_{U,V}(f) = \pi_{A/I}(f) - \pi^{(1)}_{A/I}(\phi_{A/I}(f)) = 0$$

so $h_{U,V}$ vanishes on the generators of $I_{(U,V)}$ and consequently $\mathcal{I}_{(U,V)} \subseteq \ker h_{U,V}$.

Therefore, since $h_{U,V}$ is surjective we see that there exists a homomorphism $\overline{h_{U,V}} : C^*(\mathcal{Q})/\mathcal{I}_{(U,V)} \to \mathcal{O}(C_0(V), X/XI)$ given by

$$\overline{h_{U,V}}(a + \mathcal{I}_{(U,V)}) = h_{U,V}(a).$$

In addition, since $\psi_{\mathcal{Q}}(XI) \subseteq \mathcal{I}_{(U,V)}$ there exists a linear map $\psi_0 : X/XI \to C^*(\mathcal{Q})/\mathcal{I}_{(U,V)}$ given by

$$\psi_0(q^{XI}(x)) = \psi_{\mathcal{Q}}(x) + \mathcal{I}_{(U,V)}.$$

And likewise, since $\pi_{\mathcal{Q}}(A) \subseteq \mathcal{I}_{(U,V)}$ there exits a homomorphism $\pi_0 : A/I \to C^*(\mathcal{Q})/I_{(U,V)}$ given by

$$\pi_0(q^I(a)) = \pi_{\mathcal{Q}}(a) + \mathcal{I}_{(U,V)}.$$

It is straightforward to verify that (ψ_0, π_0) is a Toeplitz representation of X/XI into $C^*(\mathcal{Q})/\mathcal{I}_{(U,V)}$. Furthermore, by [19, Lemma 2.6(2)] there exists a surjective homomorphism $q_{\mathcal{K}} : \mathcal{K}(X) \to \mathcal{K}(X/XI)$ with

$$q_{\mathcal{K}}(\Theta^X_{x,y}) = \Theta^{X/XI}_{q^{XI}(x),q^{XI}(y)}.$$

Now for any $x, y \in X$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} h_{U,V} \circ \pi^{(1)}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\Theta^X_{x,y}) &= h_{U,V}(\psi_{\mathcal{Q}}(x)\psi_{\mathcal{Q}}(y)^*) \\ &= \psi_{X/XI}(q^{XI}(x))\psi_{X/XI}(q^{XI}(y))^* \\ &= \pi^{(1)}_{A/I}(\Theta^{X/XI}_{q^{XI}(x),q^{XI}(y)}) \\ &= \pi^{(1)}_{A/I} \circ q_{\mathcal{K}}(\Theta^X_{x,y}) \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$h_{U,V} \circ \pi^{(1)}_{\mathcal{Q}} = \pi^{(1)}_{A/I} \circ q_{\mathcal{K}}. \tag{8.2}$$

Likewise, for all $x, y \in X$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \pi^{(1)}_0(q_{\mathcal{K}}(\Theta^X_{x,y})) &= \pi^{(1)}_0(\Theta^{X/XI}_{q^{XI}(x),q^{XI}(y)}) \\ &= \psi_0(q^{XI}(x))\psi_0(q^{XI}(y))^* \\ &= q^{\mathcal{I}_{(U,V)}}(\psi_{\mathcal{Q}}(x)\psi_{\mathcal{Q}}(y)^*) \\ &= q^{\mathcal{I}_{(U,V)}}(\pi^{(1)}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\Theta^X_{x,y})) \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\pi^{(1)}_0 \circ q_{\mathcal{K}} = q^{\mathcal{I}_{(U,V)}} \circ \pi^{(1)}_{\mathcal{Q}}. \tag{8.3}$$

We shall now use (8.2) and (8.3) to show that (ψ_0, π_0) is coisometric on $C_0(V)$. If $f \in A = C_0(V)$ and $q^I(f) \in C_0(V)$, then because $q_{\mathcal{K}}$ is surjective there exists $T \in \mathcal{K}(X)$ with $q_{\mathcal{K}}(T) = \phi_{A/I}(q^I(f))$, and

$$\begin{aligned} h_{U,V}(\pi_{\mathcal{Q}}(f) - \pi^{(1)}_{\mathcal{Q}}(T)) &= h_{U,V}(\pi_{\mathcal{Q}}(f)) - h_{U,V}(\pi^{(1)}_{\mathcal{Q}}(T)) \\ &= \pi_{A/I}(q^I(f)) - \pi^{(1)}_{A/I}(q_{\mathcal{K}}(T)) \\ &= \pi_{A/I}(q^I(f)) - \pi^{(1)}_{A/I}(\phi_{A/I}(q^I(f))) \\ &= T_{U,V}(q^I(f)). \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\pi_{\mathcal{Q}}(f) - \pi^{(1)}_{\mathcal{Q}}(T) \in h^{-1}_{U,V}(T_{U,V}(C_0(V))) \subseteq \mathcal{I}_{(U,V)}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_0(q^I(f)) - \pi^{(1)}_0(\phi_{A/I}(q^I(f))) &= q^{\mathcal{I}_{(U,V)}}(\pi_{\mathcal{Q}}(f)) - \pi^{(1)}_{\mathcal{Q}}(q_{\mathcal{K}}(T)) \\ &= q^{\mathcal{I}_{(U,V)}}(\pi_{\mathcal{Q}}(f)) - q^{\mathcal{I}_{(U,V)}}(\pi^{(1)}_{\mathcal{Q}}(T)) \\ &= q^{\mathcal{I}_{(U,V)}}(\pi_{\mathcal{Q}}(f) - \pi^{(1)}_{\mathcal{Q}}(T)) \\ &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

so that (ψ_0, π_0) is coisometric on $C_0(V)$. It follows that (ψ_0, π_0) induces a homomorphism $\rho_{(\psi_0,\pi_0)} : \mathcal{O}(C_0(V), X/XI) \to C^*(\mathcal{Q})/\mathcal{I}_{(U,V)}$ and it is straightforward to check that $\rho_{(\psi_0,\pi_0)}$ is an inverse for $\overline{h_{U,V}}$ (simply check on generators, cf. the proof of [19, Theorem 3.1]). Thus $\overline{h_{U,V}}$ is an isomorphism from $C^*(\mathcal{Q})/I_{(U,V)}$ onto $\mathcal{O}(C_0(V), X/XI)$, and consequently $\ker h_{U,V} = \mathcal{I}_{(U,V)}$. □

Lemma 8.21. *Let X be a C^*-correspondence over a C^*-algebra A, let K be an ideal in $J(X)$, and let (ψ, π) be a universal Toeplitz representation of X in $\mathcal{O}(K, X)$ which is coisometric on K. Also define a homomorphism $T : J(X) \to \mathcal{O}(K, X)$ by*

$$T(a) := \pi(a) - \pi^{(1)}(\phi(a)).$$

If K_0 is an ideal in $J(X)$ with $K \subseteq K_0$, and if (ψ_0, π_0) is a universal Toeplitz representation of X in $\mathcal{O}(K_0, X)$ which is coisometric on K_0, then (ψ_0, π_0) induces a homomorphism $\rho_{(\psi_0,\pi_0)} : \mathcal{O}(K, X) \to \mathcal{O}(K_0, X)$ and $\ker \rho_{(\psi_0,\pi_0)}$ is equal to the ideal in $\mathcal{O}(K, X)$ generated by $T(K_0)$.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{I}$ denote the ideal in in $\mathcal{O}(K, X)$ generated by $T(K_0)$. We see that for any $a \in K_0$ we have $\rho_{(\psi_0,\pi_0)}(T(a)) = \pi_0(a) - \pi_0^{(1)}(\phi(a)) = 0$ and thus $T(K_0) \subseteq \ker \rho_{(\psi_0,\pi_0)}$, and $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \ker \rho_{(\psi_0,\pi_0)}$.

Let $q : \mathcal{O}(K, X)/\mathcal{I} \to \mathcal{O}(K, X)/\ker \rho_{(\psi_0,\pi_0)}$ be the quotient map. If we define $(\psi', \pi') := (q^{\mathcal{I}} \circ \psi, q^{\mathcal{I}} \circ \pi)$, then it is straightforward to verify that (ψ', π') is a Toeplitz representation of X into $\mathcal{O}(K, X)/\mathcal{I}$ which is coisometric on K_0. Thus (ψ', π') induces a homomorphism $\rho_{(\psi',\pi')} : \mathcal{O}(K_0, X) \to \mathcal{O}(K, X)/\mathcal{I}$. If we let $\overline{\rho}_{(\psi_0,\pi_0)} : \mathcal{O}(K, X)/\ker \rho_{(\psi_0,\pi_0)} \to \mathcal{O}(K_0, X)$ denote the canonical isomorphism, then it is straightforward to check that $\rho_{(\psi',\pi')} \circ \overline{\rho}_{(\psi_0,\pi_0)} \circ q$ is the identity on $\mathcal{O}(K, X)/\mathcal{I}$ (simply check on the generators $q^{\mathcal{I}}(\pi(A)) \cup q^{\mathcal{I}}(\psi(X))$), and thus q is injective and $\mathcal{I} = \ker \rho_{(\psi_0,\pi_0)}$. □

Theorem 8.22. *Let $\mathcal{Q} = (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ be a topological quiver. Then there is a bijective correspondence from the set of admissible pairs of $\mathcal{Q}$ onto the gauge-invariant ideals of $C^*(\mathcal{Q})$ given by*

$$(U, V) \mapsto \mathcal{I}_{(U,V)}.$$

Furthermore, for any admissible pair (U, V) we have that

$$C^*(\mathcal{Q})/\mathcal{I}_{(U,V)} \cong C^*(\mathcal{Q}_{(U,V)}).$$

Proof. Let X be the C^*-correspondence over $A = C_0(E^0)$ associated to $\mathcal{Q}$, and let $(\psi_{\mathcal{Q}}, \pi_{\mathcal{Q}})$ denote a universal Toeplitz representation of X into $C^*(\mathcal{Q})$ which is coisometric on $C_0(E^0_{\text{reg}})$.

To begin, we see that $\mathcal{I}_{(U,V)}$ is in fact gauge invariant since

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_{(U,V)} = \overline{\operatorname{span}}\{&\psi_{\mathcal{Q}}(x_1) \ldots \psi_{\mathcal{Q}}(x_n) z \psi_{\mathcal{Q}}(y_1)^* \ldots \psi_{\mathcal{Q}}(y_m)^* : x_1 \ldots x_n \in X, \\ &y_1 \ldots y_m \in X, \text{and } z \in \pi_{\mathcal{Q}}(C_0(U)) \cup h_{U,V}^{-1}(T_{U,V}(C_0(V)))\}. \end{aligned}$$

Surjectivity: To see that the map is surjective, let $\mathcal{I}$ be a gauge-invariant ideal in $C^*(\mathcal{Q}) = \mathcal{O}(C_0(E^0_{\text{reg}}), X)$. Define U to be the open subset of E^0 for which $C_0(U) = \pi_{\mathcal{Q}}^{-1}(\mathcal{I})$. It follows from Lemma 8.7 that $C_0(U)$ is X-saturated and X-invariant, and thus Lemma 8.4 implies that U is saturated and hereditary. Let $I := C_0(U)$ and define (ψ, π) to be the universal Toeplitz representation of X/XI into $\mathcal{O}(q^I(C_0(E^0_{\text{reg}})), X/XI)$ which is coisometric on $q^I(C_0(E^0_{\text{reg}}))$. It follows from

[19, Lemma 2.9(2)] that $(\psi \circ q^{XI}, \pi \circ q^I)$ is a Toeplitz representation of X which is coisometric on $C_0(E^0_{\mathrm{reg}})$, and thus it induces a homomorphism $h := \rho_{(\psi \circ q^{XI}, \pi \circ q^I)}$. We shall also define a homomorphism $T : J_{X/XI} \to \mathcal{O}(q^I(C_0(E^0_{\mathrm{reg}})), X/XI)$ by

$$T(q^I(a)) := \pi(q^I(a)) - \pi^{(1)}(\phi_{A/I}(q^I(a))),$$

and we define V to be the open subset of $(E^0_U)_{\mathrm{reg}}$ with the property that $C_0(V) = T^{-1}(h(\mathcal{I}))$. Since $q^I(C_0(E^0_{\mathrm{reg}})) = C_0(E^0_{\mathrm{reg}} \backslash U)$ we see that (U, V) is an admissible pair of $\mathcal{Q}$. If (ψ_0, π_0) is the universal representation of X/XI into $\mathcal{O}(C_0(V), X/XI)$ which is coisometric on $C_0(V)$, then it induces a homomorphism $\rho := \rho_{(\psi_0, \pi_0)} : \mathcal{O}(q^I(C_0(E^0_{\mathrm{reg}})), X/XI) \to \mathcal{O}(C_0(V), X/XI)$, and the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X \arrow[r, "q^{XI}"] \arrow[dr, "\psi_{\mathcal{Q}}"'] & X/XI \arrow[dr, "\psi"] \arrow[drr, bend left, "\psi_0"] & & \\
& \mathcal{O}(C_0(E^0_{\mathrm{reg}}), X) \arrow[r, dotted, "h"] & \mathcal{O}(q^I(C_0(E^0_{\mathrm{reg}})), X/XI) \arrow[r, dotted, "\rho"] & \mathcal{O}(C_0(V), X/XI) \\
A \arrow[r, "q^I"] \arrow[ur, "\pi_{\mathcal{Q}}"] & A/I \arrow[ur, "\pi"'] \arrow[urr, bend right, "\pi_0"'] & &
\end{tikzcd}$$

Furthermore, we see that $h_{U,V} = \rho \circ h$, and $T_{U,V} = \rho \circ T$. Now clearly

$$\pi_{\mathcal{Q}}(C_0(U)) \subseteq \mathcal{I} \tag{8.4}$$

by the definition of U. In addition, if $x \in h^{-1}_{U,V}(T_{U,V}(C_0(V)))$, then

$$\rho(h(x)) = h_{U,V}(x) \in T_{U,V}(C_0(V)) = \rho(T(C_0(V))) = \rho(T(T^{-1}(h(\mathcal{I})))) = \rho(h(\mathcal{I})),$$

and Lemma 8.21 implies that $\ker \rho$ is equal to the ideal in $\mathcal{O}(q^I(C_0(E^0_{\mathrm{reg}})), X/XI)$ generated by $T(C_0(V)) = h(\mathcal{I})$. Since $h(\mathcal{I})$ is an ideal, this implies that $\ker \rho = h(\mathcal{I})$, and the fact that $\rho(h(x)) \in \rho(h(\mathcal{I}))$ then implies that $h(x) \in h(\mathcal{I})$. However, [19, Lemma 3.1] implies that $\ker h$ is equal to the ideal in $\mathcal{O}(C_0(E^0_{\mathrm{reg}}), X/XI)$ generated by $\pi_{\mathcal{Q}}(C_0(U))$. Since Eq. 8.4 shows that $\mathcal{I}$ is an ideal containing $\pi_{\mathcal{Q}}(C_0(U))$, we then have that $\ker h \subseteq \mathcal{I}$. But then $h(x) \in h(\mathcal{I})$ implies that $x \in \mathcal{I}$. Thus we have shown that

$$h^{-1}_{U,V}(T_{U,V}(C_0(V))) \subseteq \mathcal{I}. \tag{8.5}$$

It follows from Eq. 8.4 and Eq. 8.5 that $\mathcal{I}_{(U,V)} \subseteq \mathcal{I}$.

Let $q : \mathcal{O}(C_0(E^0_{\mathrm{reg}}), X)/\mathcal{I}_{(U,V)} \to \mathcal{O}(C_0(E^0_{\mathrm{reg}}), X)/\mathcal{I}$ be the canonical quotient map. It follows from Lemma 8.20 that $h_{U,V}$ induces an isomorphism

$$\overline{h}_{U,V} : \mathcal{O}(C_0(E^0_{\mathrm{reg}}), X)/\mathcal{I}_{(U,V)} \to \mathcal{O}(C_0(V), X/XI).$$

Define $\kappa := q \circ \overline{h}^{-1}_{U,V}$. We shall show that the hypotheses of Corollary 7.15 hold. To begin, for any $a \in A$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\kappa(\pi_0(q^I(a))) &= q(\overline{h}^{-1}_{U,V}(\pi_0(q^I(a)))) \\
&= q(q^{\mathcal{I}_{(U,V)}}(\pi_{\mathcal{Q}}(a))) \\
&= q^{\mathcal{I}}(\pi_{\mathcal{Q}}(a))
\end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\kappa(\pi_0(q^I(a))) = 0 \iff \pi_{\mathcal{Q}}(a) \in \mathcal{I} \iff a \in I := C_0(U) \iff q^I(a) = 0$$

and the restriction of κ to $\pi_0(A/I)$ is injective.

Next, for any $q^I(a) \in J_{X/XI} = C_0((E_U^0)_{\mathrm{reg}})$ it follows from [19, Lemma 2.7] that $\phi_{A/I}(q^I(a)) = q_{\mathcal{K}}(\phi(a))$. Thus Eq. 8.3 implies that

$$q^{\mathcal{I}_{(U,V)}}(\pi_{\mathcal{Q}}^{(1)}(\phi(a))) = \pi_0^{(1)}(\phi_{A/I}(q^I(a))),$$

and consequently

$$\begin{aligned}\kappa\left(\pi_0(q^I(a)) - \pi_0^{(1)}(\phi_{A/I}(q^I(a)))\right) &= q(\overline{h}_{U,V}^{-1}(\pi_0(q^I(a)) - \pi_0^{(1)}(\phi_{A/I}(q^I(a))))) \\ &= q(q^{\mathcal{I}_{(U,V)}}(\pi_{\mathcal{Q}}(a)) - q^{\mathcal{I}_{(U,V)}}(\pi_{\mathcal{Q}}^{(1)}(\phi(a)))) \\ &= q^{\mathcal{I}}(\pi_{\mathcal{Q}}(a) - \pi_{\mathcal{Q}}^{(1)}(\phi(a)))\end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned}\kappa\left(\pi_0(q^I(a)) - \pi_0^{(1)}(\phi_{A/I}(q^I(a)))\right) = 0 &\Longrightarrow \pi_{\mathcal{Q}}(a) - \pi_{\mathcal{Q}}^{(1)}(\phi(a)) \in \mathcal{I} \\ &\Longrightarrow h_{U,V}(\pi_{\mathcal{Q}}(a) - \pi_{\mathcal{Q}}^{(1)}(\phi(a))) \in h_{U,V}(\mathcal{I}) \\ &\Longrightarrow \pi_0(q^I(a)) - \pi_0^{(1)}(\phi_{A/I}(q^I(a))) \in h_{U,V}(\mathcal{I}) \\ &\Longrightarrow \rho(\pi(q^I(a)) - \pi^{(1)}(\phi_{A/I}(q^I(a)))) \in \rho(h(\mathcal{I}))\end{aligned}$$

and since $\ker\rho = h(\mathcal{I})$, we see that $\kappa\left(\pi_0(q^I(a)) - \pi_0^{(1)}(\phi_{A/I}(q^I(a)))\right) = 0$ implies that $\pi(q^I(a)) - \pi^{(1)}(\phi_{A/I}(q^I(a))) \in h(\mathcal{I})$ so that $q^I(a) \in C_0(V)$ and $\pi_0(q^I(a)) - \pi_0^{(1)}(\phi_{A/I}(q^I(a))) = 0$. Thus the restriction of κ to $(\pi_0 - \pi_0^{(1)} \circ \phi_{A/I})(C_0((E_U^0)_{\mathrm{reg}}))$ is injective.

Finally, since $\mathcal{I}$ is a gauge-invariant ideal, the gauge action of $C^*(\mathcal{Q})$ descends to a gauge action on $C^*(\mathcal{Q})/\mathcal{I}$, and by checking on generators one can easily verify that κ intertwines this gauge action and the canonical gauge action on $\mathcal{O}(C_0(V), X/XI)$.

The previous three paragraphs show that the hypotheses of Corollary 7.15 hold, and thus $\kappa := q \circ \overline{h}_{U,V}^{-1}$ is injective. Since $\overline{h}_{U,V}^{-1}$ is an isomorphism, it follows that $q : \mathcal{O}(C_0(E^0_{\mathrm{reg}}), X)/\mathcal{I}_{(U,V)} \to \mathcal{O}(C_0(E^0_{\mathrm{reg}}), X)/\mathcal{I}$ is injective and thus $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}_{(U,V)}$.

Injectivity: To see that the map $(U,V) \mapsto \mathcal{I}_{(U,V)}$ is injective, we need to show that whenever (U,V) is an admissible pair, then

$$\pi_{\mathcal{Q}}(a) \in \mathcal{I}_{(U,V)} \iff a \in C_0(U) \qquad \text{for all } a \in A$$

and

$$h_{U,V}^{-1}(T_{U,V}(q^I(a))) \subseteq \mathcal{I}_{(U,V)} \iff q^I(a) \in C_0(V) \ \text{ for all } q^I(a) \in J(X/XI).$$

To begin, we see that if $a \in C_0(U)$, then $\pi_{\mathcal{Q}}(a) \in \mathcal{I}_{(U,V)}$ by the definition of $\mathcal{I}_{(U,V)}$. For the converse, let $\pi_{\mathcal{Q}}(a) \in \mathcal{I}_{(U,V)}$. By Lemma 8.20 we have that $\ker h_{U,V} = \mathcal{I}_{(U,V)}$, and thus we see that $\pi_0(q^I(a)) = h_{U,V}(\pi_{\mathcal{Q}}(a)) = 0$. But Corollary 4.6 implies that π_0 is faithful, and thus $q^I(a) = 0$ and $a \in I = C_0(U)$.

In addition, we see that $q^I(a) \in C_0(V)$ implies that $h_{U,V}^{-1}(T_{U,V}(q^I(a))) \subseteq \mathcal{I}_{(U,V)}$ by the definition of $\mathcal{I}_{(U,V)}$. For the converse, let $q^I(a) \in J(X/XI)$ with $h_{U,V}^{-1}(T_{U,V}(q^I(a))) \subseteq \mathcal{I}_{(U,V)}$. Then since $\mathcal{I}_{(U,V)} = \ker h_{U,V}$ we see that

$$T_{U,V}(q^I(a)) = h_{U,V}(h_{U,V}^{-1}(T_{U,V}(q^I(a)))) = 0$$

and by Lemma 2.9 we have that $q^I(a) \in C_0(V)$.

Quotient: Finally, we see from Lemma 8.20 that $C^*(\mathcal{Q})/\mathcal{I}_{(U,V)} \cong \mathcal{O}(C_0(V), X/XI)$, and it follows from Corollary 7.14 that $\mathcal{O}(C_0(V), X/XI) \cong C^*(\mathcal{Q}_U(V)) = C^*(\mathcal{Q}_{(U,V)})$. □

Corollary 8.23. *Let $\mathcal{Q} = (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ be a topological quiver with the property that $E^0_{\text{fin}} = E^0$ and the property that $\overline{s(E^1)}$ is a clopen subset of E^0. Then there is a bijective correspondence from the set of saturated hereditary open subsets of E^0 onto the gauge-invariant ideals of $C^*(\mathcal{Q})$ given by*

$$U \mapsto \mathcal{I}_U := \text{ the ideal in } C^*(\mathcal{Q}) \text{ generated by } \pi_{\mathcal{Q}}(C_0(U)).$$

Furthermore, for any saturated hereditary open subset U we have that

$$C^*(\mathcal{Q})/\mathcal{I}_U \cong C^*(\mathcal{Q}_U).$$

Proof. It follows from Lemma 8.12 that $E^0_{\text{reg}} \backslash U = (E^0_U)_{\text{reg}}$ for any saturated hereditary open set U. Thus the only admissible pairs for $\mathcal{Q}$ are of the form $(U, (E^0_U)_{\text{reg}})$. The corollary then follows from the fact that $\mathcal{I}_{(U,(E^0_U)_{\text{reg}})} = \mathcal{I}_U$. □

9. A Condition for all Ideals to be Gauge-Invariant

In analogy with graph algebras (see [5, Theorem 4.4] and [4, Corollary 3.8]) we shall give a condition for a topological quiver to satisfy that will ensure that all ideals in the associated C^*-algebra are gauge-invariant.

Definition 9.1. The following definition generalizes Condition (K) defined for graphs in [35, §6] (which, in turn, generalizes Condition (II) for Cuntz-Krieger algebras).

Condition (K): For every saturated hereditary open subset U of $\mathcal{Q}$, the subquiver $\mathcal{Q}_U$ of Definition 8.8 satisfies Condition (L).

Remark 9.2. If (U, V) is an admissible pair for $\mathcal{Q}$, then we see that any loop in $\mathcal{Q}_{(U,V)}$ must have all of its vertices in $\mathcal{Q}_U$ (since the other vertices are sinks). Thus $\mathcal{Q}_{(U,V)}$ satisfies Condition (L) if and only if $\mathcal{Q}_U$ satisfies Condition (L). Consequently, Condition (K) is equivalent to requiring that $\mathcal{Q}_{(U,V)}$ satisfies Condition (L) for every admissible pair (U, V).

Definition 9.3. If $\mathcal{Q}$ is a topological quiver, we say that a loop $\alpha = \alpha_1 \ldots \alpha_n$ is *simple* if $s(\alpha_i) \neq s(\alpha_1)$ for all $i \in \{2, 3, \ldots, n\}$.

Remark 9.4. In light of how Condition (L) was generalized from graphs to topological quivers in Definition 6.9, one might conjecture that Condition (K) is equivalent to requiring that the set of all base points of simple loops in $\mathcal{Q}$ has empty interior. This turns out to not be the case as the following example shows: Let $\mathcal{Q}$ be the topological quiver defined by letting $E^0 = [0, 2]$, $E^1 = [0, 1]$, $r : E^1 \to E^0$ by $r(x) = 2x$, and $s : E^1 \to E^0$ by $s(x) = x$. Then there is only one simple loop in $\mathcal{Q}$ and it is based at the point 0. Furthermore, the set $\{0\}$ is not open. However, $U := (0, 2]$ is a saturated hereditary subset, and $\mathcal{Q}_U$ is the graph with one vertex and one edge, which does not satisfy Condition (L).

Definition 9.5. If $\mathcal{Q} = (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ is a topological quiver and $v, w \in E^0$, then we write $w \geq v$ to mean that there is a path $\alpha \in E^n$ with $s(\alpha) = w$ and $r(\alpha) = v$. We also define $v^{\geq} := \{w \in E^0 : w \geq v\}$.

Proposition 9.6. *Let $\mathcal{Q} = (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ be a topological quiver, let $v \in E^0$ be a vertex which is isolated in $v^{\geq}$, and suppose that there is a unique simple loop $\alpha = \alpha_1 \ldots \alpha_n$ whose base point is v. If $\gamma \in E^1$ is an edge with $r(\gamma) \in \overline{v^{\geq}}$ and $s(\gamma) = s(\alpha_i)$ for some $i \in \{1, \ldots n\}$, then $\gamma = \alpha_i$.*

Proof. We shall prove the theorem inductively. Suppose first that $i = 1$. Now if N is any neighborhood of γ in E^1, then because r is an open map we see that the set $r(N)$ is a neighborhood of $r(\gamma)$. Since $r(\gamma) \in \overline{v^{\geq}}$, there is an edge $\beta \in N$ with $r(\beta) \in v^{\geq}$. Because N was arbitrary, this shows that we may choose a sequence of edges $\{\beta_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty} \subseteq E^1$ with $\lim_k \beta_k = \gamma$ and $r(\beta_k) \in v^{\geq}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. The fact that s is continuous implies that $\lim_k s(\beta_k) = s(\gamma) = v$, and since $\{r(\beta_k)\}_{k=1}^{\infty} \subseteq v^{\geq}$ implies that $\{s(\beta_k)\}_{k=1}^{\infty} \subseteq v^{\geq}$, and v is isolated in $v^{\geq}$, it follows that there exists $M \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $s(\beta_k) = v$ for all $k \geq M$. But then, since $r(\beta_k) \in v^{\geq}$ for all k, we see that for all $k \geq M$ there is a loop based at v whose initial edge is β_k. Since $\alpha = \alpha_1 \ldots \alpha_n$ is the unique simple loop based at v, this implies that $\beta_k = \alpha_1$ for all $k \geq M$. Thus $\gamma = \lim_k \beta_k = \alpha_1$.

Using the fact that the proposition holds for $i = 1$, we can then show it also holds for $i = 2$. Since $s(\alpha_1) = v$ is isolated in $v^{\geq}$, it follows that $s(\alpha_1) = v$ is isolated in $\overline{v^{\geq}}$. Consequently, the singleton set $\{v\}$ is open in $\overline{v^{\geq}}$. Because s is continuous and r is open, it follows that $r(s^{-1}(v)) \cap \overline{v^{\geq}}$ is an open subset of $\overline{v^{\geq}}$. But because the proposition holds for $i = 1$ we see that $r(s^{-1}(v)) \cap \overline{v^{\geq}} = \{r(\alpha_1)\} = \{s(\alpha_2)\}$. Thus $\{s(\alpha_2)\}$ is open in $\overline{v^{\geq}}$, and $\{s(\alpha_2)\}$ is isolated in $\overline{v^{\geq}}$. Using an argument as in the first paragraph, we can show that if γ is an edge with $s(\gamma) = s(\alpha_2)$ and $r(\gamma) \in \overline{v^{\geq}}$, then it must be the case that $\gamma = \alpha_2$.

Arguing in a recursive fashion, we are then able to show that the proposition holds for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$. ☐

Lemma 9.7. *Let $\mathcal{Q} = (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ be a topological quiver. If H is a saturated hereditary subset of E^0, then* $\operatorname{Int} H$ *is a saturated hereditary open subset of E^0.*

Proof. Clearly, $\operatorname{Int} H$ is open. To see that $\operatorname{Int} H$ is hereditary, let $\alpha \in E^1$ with $s(\alpha) \in \operatorname{Int} H$. Then there exists an open set $V \subseteq H$ with $s(\alpha) \in V$. But since H is hereditary, we have that $r(s^{-1}(V)) \subseteq H$. Furthermore, since s is continuous and r is open it follows that $r(s^{-1}(V))$ is a neighborhood of $r(\alpha)$ which is contained in H. Thus $r(\alpha) \in \operatorname{Int} H$, and $\operatorname{Int} H$ is hereditary.

To see that $\operatorname{Int} H$ is saturated, let V be an open subset of E^0_{reg} with $r(s^{-1}(V)) \subseteq \operatorname{Int} H$. Since $\operatorname{Int} H \subseteq H$ and H is saturated, we see that we must have $V \subseteq H$. But since V is open, it follows that $V \subseteq \operatorname{Int} H$. We then have from Lemma 8.4 that $\operatorname{Int} H$ is saturated. ☐

Lemma 9.8. *Let $\mathcal{Q} = (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ be a topological quiver. If v is the base point of a loop in $\mathcal{Q}$, then $H := \{w \in E^0 : w \ngeq v\}$ is a saturated hereditary subset of E^0 and*

$$\operatorname{Int} H = E^0 \backslash \overline{v^{\geq}}$$

is a saturated hereditary open subset of E^0.

Proof. If $\alpha \in E^1$ and $s(\alpha) \ngeq v$, then it must be the case that $r(\alpha) \ngeq w$. Thus H is hereditary. In addition, the fact that v is on a loop shows that whenever $v \in E^0$ with $r(s^{-1}(v)) \subseteq H$, then we must have $v \in H$. Hence H is saturated.

Since H is saturated and hereditary, it follows from Lemma 9.7 that $\operatorname{Int} H = \operatorname{Int}(E^0 \backslash v^{\geq}) = E^0 \backslash \overline{v^{\geq}}$ is a saturated hereditary open subset of E^0. ☐

Proposition 9.9. *If $\mathcal{Q} = (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ is a topological quiver, then $\mathcal{Q}$ satisfies Condition (K) if and only if the set*

$$\{v \in E^0 : v \textit{ is the base point of exactly one simple loop and } v \textit{ is isolated in } v^{\geq} \}$$

is empty.

Proof. Suppose that $\mathcal{Q}$ does not satisfy Condition (K). Then there exists a saturated hereditary open subset $U \subseteq E^0$ with the property that $\mathcal{Q}_U$ does not satisfy Condition (L). Let V be an open subset of $\mathcal{Q}_U^0 := E^0 \backslash U$ in which every vertex is the base of a loop with no exits in $\mathcal{Q}_U$. Choose an element $v \in V$, and let $\alpha = \alpha_1 \dots \alpha_n$ be a loop of minimal length based at v with no exits in $\mathcal{Q}_U$. By minimality α is simple, and since α has no loops in $\mathcal{Q}_U$ and U is hereditary, it follows that α is the unique simple loop in $\mathcal{Q}$ based at v. Furthermore, after possibly shrinking V, we may assume that $V \cap \{r(\alpha_i)\}_{i=1}^{n-1} = \emptyset$. We shall now show that v is isolated in $v^{\geq}$. Suppose that $\{v_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ is a sequence of vertices in $v^{\geq}$ that converges to v. Since $v \notin U$ and U is saturated hereditary, it follows that $v^{\geq} \subseteq E^0 \backslash U = \mathcal{Q}_U^0$. Thus for large enough i we have that v_i is in V. But $V \cap v^{\geq} = \{v\}$ since any vertex in V is on a unique simple loop in $\mathcal{Q}_U$ and no vertices of α other than v are in V. Thus for large enough v we must have that v_i equals v, and consequently v is isolated in $v^{\geq}$. Hence we have shown that v is a vertex that is the base point of exactly one simple loop and v is isolated in $v^{\geq}$.

For the converse suppose that there exists a vertex v that is the base point of exactly one simple loop $\alpha = \alpha_1 \dots \alpha_n$ and that v is isolated in $v^{\geq}$. If we define $U := E^0 \backslash \overline{v^{\geq}}$, then it follows from Lemma 9.8 that U is a saturated hereditary open set. Let us now consider the subquiver $\mathcal{Q}_U$. Since v is isolated in $v^{\geq}$ it follows that v is isolated in $\mathcal{Q}_U^0 = \overline{v^{\geq}}$, and thus $\{v\}$ is an open subset of $\mathcal{Q}_U^0$. Furthermore, it follows from Proposition 9.6 that α has no exits in $\mathcal{Q}_U$. Thus $\mathcal{Q}_U$ does not satisfy Condition (L), and $\mathcal{Q}$ does not satisfy Condition (K). ☐

Theorem 9.10. *Let $\mathcal{Q} = (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ be a topological quiver that satisfies Condition (K). Then every ideal in $C^*(\mathcal{Q})$ is gauge invariant.*

Proof. Since $\mathcal{Q}_U$ satisfies Condition (L) for every saturated hereditary open subset U, we may repeat the proof of surjectivity in Theorem 8.22 and use Corollary 7.16 in place of Corollary 7.15. This shows that every ideal is of the form $\mathcal{I}_{(U,V)}$ for some admissible pair (U, V), and consequently every ideal is gauge invariant. ☐

Theorem 8.22 and Corollary 8.23 then give us the following corollaries.

Corollary 9.11. *Let $\mathcal{Q} = (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ be a topological quiver that satisfies Condition (K) . Then there is a bijective correspondence from the set of admissible pairs of $\mathcal{Q}$ onto the ideals of $C^*(\mathcal{Q})$ given by*

$$(U, V) \mapsto \mathcal{I}_{(U,V)}.$$

Furthermore, for any admissible pair (U, V) we have $C^*(\mathcal{Q})/\mathcal{I}_{(U,V)} \cong C^*(\mathcal{Q}_{(U,V)})$.

Corollary 9.12. *Let $\mathcal{Q} = (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ be a topological quiver satisfying Condition (K) with the property that $E^0_{\mathrm{fin}} = E^0$ and the property that $\overline{s(E^1)}$ is a clopen* *subset of* E^0*. Then there is a bijective correspondence from the set of saturated hereditary open subsets of* E^0 *onto the ideals of* $C^*(\mathcal{Q})$ *given by*

$$U \mapsto \mathcal{I}_U := \text{ the ideal in } C^*(\mathcal{Q}) \text{ generated by } \pi_{\mathcal{Q}}(C_0(U)).$$

Furthermore, for any saturated hereditary open subset U *we have* $C^*(\mathcal{Q})/\mathcal{I}_U \cong C^*(\mathcal{Q}_U)$*.*

10. Simplicity of C^*-algebras associated to Topological Quivers

Definition 10.1. We say that a topological quiver $\mathcal{Q} = (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ is *minimal* if the only saturated hereditary open subsets of $\mathcal{Q}$ are E^0 and $\emptyset$.

This section shall be devoted to proving the following theorem.

Theorem 10.2. *If* $\mathcal{Q} = (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ *is a topological quiver, then* $C^*(\mathcal{Q})$ *is simple if and only if* $\mathcal{Q}$ *is minimal and satisfies Condition (L).*

To prove this theorem we shall need a number of lemmas.

Definition 10.3. If $\mathcal{Q} = (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ is a topological quiver, then we define the following subsets of E^0: For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we define L_n to be the set of base points of loops of length n with no exits, and we also define L_n^s to be the set of base points of simple loops of length n with no exits. Furthermore, we define L_∞ to be the set of base points of loops with no exits.

One can easily check that $L_n^s = L_n \backslash \bigcup_{k=1}^{n-1} L_k$ for all $n \in N$, and that $L_\infty = \bigcup_{n=1}^\infty L_n^s = \bigcup_{n=1}^\infty L_n$. We also mention that $\mathcal{Q}$ satisfies Condition (L) if and only if L_∞ has empty interior. In addition, if $v \in L_\infty$, then v is the base point of a unique simple loop (the uniqueness is due to the fact that any other simple loop would provide an exit).

Lemma 10.4. *Let* $\mathcal{Q} = (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ *be a topological quiver. If* $\alpha, \alpha' \in E^1$ *with* $s(\alpha), s(\alpha') \in L_\infty$ *and* $r(\alpha) = r(\alpha')$*, then* $\alpha = \alpha'$*.*

Proof. We see that any $v \in L_\infty$ is the base of exactly one simple loop, and furthermore, this loop must have no exits. Since $s(\alpha), s(\alpha') \in L_\infty$ and $r(\alpha) = r(\alpha')$, we see that $s(\alpha)$ and $s(\alpha')$ must lie on the same simple loop with no exits. But because $r(\alpha) = r(\alpha')$, the only way that this can occur is if $\alpha = \alpha'$. □

The following lemma and its proof were described to the authors by Takeshi Katsura.

Lemma 10.5. *Let* $\mathcal{Q} = (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ *be a topological quiver. Then* L_∞ *has empty interior if and only if* L_n^s *has empty interior for all* $n \in \mathbb{N}$*.*

Proof. Since $L_\infty = \bigcup_{n=1}^\infty L_n^s$ we see that if each L_n^s has empty interior, then L_∞ has empty interior.

Conversely, suppose that L_∞ does not have empty interior. Then there exists a nonempty open subset V_0 of E^0 with $V_0 \subseteq L_\infty$. Set $V := \bigcup_{n=1}^\infty r^n((s^n)^{-1}(V_0))$. Since s^n is continuous and r^n is continuous and open, we see that V is an open subset of E^0. Furthermore, since every element of V_0 is the base point of a loop, we see that V is nonempty.

By the way V is defined we see that $r(s^{-1}(V)) = V$. Thus we may consider the restriction $r|_{s^{-1}(V)} : s^{-1}(V) \to V$. It follows from Lemma 10.4 that $r|_{s^{-1}(V)}$ is injective. In addition, since any vertex in V is on a unique simple loop, every vertex in V is the range of some edge whose source is in V, so that $r|_{s^{-1}(V)}$ is surjective. Furthermore, since r is continuous we see that the restriction $r|_{s^{-1}(V)}$ is continuous, and since r is an open map and $s^{-1}(V)$ is an open subset of E^1 it follows that $r|_{s^{-1}(V)}$ is an open map. Thus $r|_{s^{-1}(V)} : s^{-1}(V) \to V$ is a homeomorphism.

If we define $f : V \to V$ by $f = s \circ (r|_{s^{-1}(V)})^{-1}$, then f is continuous. Furthermore, because $L_n \cap V = \{v \in V : f^n(v) = v\}$, we see that $L_n \cap V$ is a closed subset of V. Since V is an open subset of a locally compact Hausdorff space, and $\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty}(L_n \cap V) = L_\infty \cap V = V$, and each of the $L_n \cap V$'s is a closed subset of V, it follows from the Baire Category Theorem (see [15, Theorem 10.3]) that there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ for which $L_n \cap V$ has empty interior. Let n be the smallest such element of $\mathbb{N}$ with this property. Then since $(L_n^s \cap V) = (L_n \cap V) \backslash \bigcup_{k=1}^{n-1}(L_k \cap V)$ we must have that $L_n^s \cap V$ contains a nonempty open subset. Hence L_n^s has empty interior. ☐

Lemma 10.6. *Let $\mathcal{Q} = (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ be a topological quiver. If $\mathcal{Q}$ is minimal and satisfies Condition (L), then $\mathcal{Q}$ satisfies Condition (K).*

Proof. Let v be an element of E^0 with the property that v is the base point of a simple loop and v is isolated in $v^{\geq}$. We shall prove that v is the base point of more than one simple loop.

Define $H := \{w \in E^0 : w \ngeq v\}$. It follows from Lemma 9.8 that $\operatorname{Int} H$ is a saturated hereditary open subset of E^0. Since $\mathcal{Q}$ is minimal, we must have that either $\operatorname{Int} H = E^0$ or $\operatorname{Int} H = \emptyset$. But since v is on a loop, we see that $v \notin H$ and consequently $v \notin \operatorname{Int} H$. Thus $\operatorname{Int} H \neq E^0$ and we must have $\operatorname{Int} H = \emptyset$.

Since $\operatorname{Int} H = \emptyset$, it follows that $E^0 \backslash H = v^{\geq}$ is dense in E^0. Additionally, because v is isolated in $v^{\geq}$, there exists an open set W of E^0 with $W \cap v^{\geq} = \{v\}$. Now if there existed an element $w \in W$ with $w \neq v$, then w would not be a limit point of $v^{\geq}$, which would contradict the fact that $v^{\geq}$ is dense in E^0. Thus we must have that $W = \{v\}$, and $\{v\}$ is an open subset of E^0.

Let $\alpha = \alpha_1 \ldots \alpha_n$ be a simple loop based at v, and define $v_i := s(\alpha_i)$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$. Since $\{v\}$ is open, the fact that $\mathcal{Q}$ satisfies Condition (L) implies that the loop α has an exit. Let k be the smallest element of $\{1, \ldots, n\}$ for which there is an exit of α whose source is $s(\alpha_k)$. Then $\{v_k\}$ is an open subset of E^0 due to the fact that $\{v_1\}$ is open and $v_i = r(s^{-1}(v_{i-1}))$ for $i = 2, \ldots, k$. Consequently $r(s^{-1}(v_k))$ is an open set, and since α has an exit at v_k one of two things must occur: Either $r(s^{-1}(v_k)) = \{v_{k+1}\}$, or $\{v_{k+1}\}$ is a proper subset of $r(s^{-1}(v_k))$. If $r(s^{-1}(v_k)) = \{v_{k+1}\}$, then the exit based at v_k has range v_{k+1} and there are multiple simple loops based at v. If $\{v_{k+1}\}$ is a proper subset of $r(s^{-1}(v_k))$ then since $v^{\geq}$ is dense in E^0 there exists an element $w \in r(s^{-1}(v_k)) \cap v^{\geq}$ with $w \neq v_{k+1}$. But then $w \geq v$ and there is more than one simple loop based at v. Thus in either case we have that v is not the base of exactly one simple loop. Hence the set

$$\{v \in E^0 : v \text{ is the base point of exactly one simple loop and } v \text{ is isolated in } v^{\geq}\}$$

is empty, and it follows from Proposition 9.9 that $\mathcal{Q}$ satisfies Condition (K). ☐

Proof of Theorem 10.2. Let $\mathcal{Q} = (E^0, E^1, r, s, \lambda)$ be a topological quiver. If $\mathcal{Q}$ is minimal and satisfies Condition (L), then it follows from Lemma 10.6 that $\mathcal{Q}$ satisfies Condition (K). But then it also follows from Corollary 9.11 that there is a bijective correspondence between the ideals of $C^*(\mathcal{Q})$ and the admissible pairs of $\mathcal{Q}$. Since $\mathcal{Q}$ is minimal, the only saturated hereditary open subsets of $\mathcal{Q}$ are E^0 and

$\emptyset$. Consequently, the only admissible pairs of $\mathcal{Q}$ are $(E^0,\emptyset)$ and $(\emptyset, E^0_{\mathrm{reg}})$, which correspond to the ideals $C^*(\mathcal{Q})$ and $\{0\}$, respectively. Thus $C^*(\mathcal{Q})$ is simple.

Conversely, suppose that $C^*(\mathcal{Q})$ is simple. Let U be a nonempty saturated hereditary open subset of $\mathcal{Q}$. Then $(U,(E^0_U)_{\mathrm{reg}})$ is an admissible pair of $\mathcal{Q}$ and $\mathcal{I}_{(U,(E^0_U)_{\mathrm{reg}})}$ is a nonzero ideal in $C^*(\mathcal{Q})$. Since $C^*(\mathcal{Q})$ is simple it follows that $\mathcal{I}_{(U,(E^0_U)_{\mathrm{reg}})} = C^*(\mathcal{Q})$, and because Theorem 8.22 states that there is a bijective correspondence between admissible pairs of $\mathcal{Q}$ and gauge-invariant ideals in $C^*(\mathcal{Q})$, we must have $(U,(E^0_U)_{\mathrm{reg}}) = (E^0,\emptyset)$. Thus $U = E^0$ and the only saturated hereditary open subsets of $\mathcal{Q}$ are E^0 and $\emptyset$. Consequently $\mathcal{Q}$ is minimal.

In addition, we shall show that $\mathcal{Q}$ satisfies Condition (L). Suppose to the contrary that $\mathcal{Q}$ does not satisfy Condition (L). Then the subset L_∞ has nonempty interior. By Lemma 10.5 there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that L^s_n has nonempty interior. Let V be a nonempty open subset of E^0 with $V \subseteq L^s_n$. Also define $V_0 := V$ and $V_k := r^k((s^k)^{-1}(V))$ for $k = 1,\ldots,n-1$. Then $W := \bigcup_{k=0}^{n-1} V_k$ is an open subset of E^0, and $W \subseteq L^s_n$. Furthermore, since every vertex in W is the base point of a simple loop with no exits, for every $v \in W$ there is a unique edge $\alpha \in E^1$ with $s(\alpha) = v$. We define a map $h : W \to W$ by $h(v) := r(\alpha)$ where α is the unique edge with $s(\alpha) = v$. We see then that

$$h(S) = r(s^{-1}(S)) \qquad \text{for any } S \subseteq W.$$

Since W is an open subset of E^0, s is an open map, and r is open, it follows that $h : W \to W$ is a continuous map. Furthermore, since every vertex in W is the base of a simple loop of length n, we see that h is a bijection, and

$$h^{-1}(S) = r^{n-1}((s^{n-1})^{-1}(S)) = h^{n-1}(S) \qquad \text{for any } S \subseteq W$$

so that h is continuous. Consequently, $h : W \to W$ is a homeomorphism.

Furthermore, every vertex $v \in W$ has the property that $h^n(v) = v$ and $h^k(v) \neq v$ for $k = 1,\ldots,n-1$. This fact, combined with the fact that $h : W \to W$ is a homeomorphism, shows that we may choose a nonempty open subset U with the property that the collection $\{h^k(U)\}_{k=0}^{n-1}\}$ is pairwise disjoint. It follows that $U' := \bigcup_{k=0}^{n-1} h^k(U)$ is a an open subset of E^0 and since every vertex in U' is the base of a loop of length n with no exits, we see that U' is a hereditary open set. It follows from Lemma 8.5 that

$$\mathcal{I}_{U'} := \text{the ideal in } C^*(\mathcal{Q}) \text{ generated by } \pi_Q(C_0(U'))$$

is X-invariant. Consequently, [19, Theorem 3.1] implies that $\mathcal{I}_{U'}$ is Morita Equivalent to $\mathcal{O}(C_0(E^0_{\mathrm{reg}}) \cap C_0(U'), X \cdot C_0(U')) \cong \mathcal{O}(C_0(U'), X \cdot C_0(U'))$, which is the C^*-algebra associated to the topological quiver $\mathcal{Q}'$ whose vertex and edge sets are

$$F^0 := U' = \bigcup_{k=0}^{n-1} h^k(U) \qquad \text{and} \qquad F^1 := \bigcup_{k=0}^{n-1} s^{-1}(h^k(U))$$

and with the restrictions $r|_{F^1}$, $s|_{F^1}$, and $\lambda|_{F^1}$ as the range map, source map, and family of measures, respectively.

We claim that $C^*(\mathcal{Q}')$ is isomorphic to $C(\mathbb{T}) \otimes M_n(\mathbb{C}) \otimes C_0(U)$. To see this, first define G to be the graph consisting of a single cycle of length n; that is, $G^0 = \{v_k\}_{k=0}^{n-1}$, $G^1 := \{\alpha_k\}_{k=0}^{n-1}$, $s(\alpha_k) = v_k$ for $0 \leq k \leq n-1$, $r(\alpha_k) = v_{k+1}$ for $0 \leq k < n-1$, and $r(\alpha_n) = v_0$. If $G \times U$ denotes the topological quiver defined in

Example 3.23, then we may construct an isomorphism between $\mathcal{Q}'$ and $G \times U$ as follows: We define $\Phi_v : G^0 \times U \to F^0$ by

$$\Phi_v(v_k, w) := h^k(w)$$

and we define $\Phi_e : G^1 \times U \to F^1$ by

$$\Phi_e(\alpha_k, w) := s^{-1}(h^k(w)).$$

Since h is a homeomorphism, it is easy to verify that (Φ_v, Φ_e) gives an isomorphism between the quivers $G \times U$ and $\mathcal{Q}'$. (We also mention that the measures in this case are all equal to counting measure, and that $r|_{F^1}^{-1}(v)$ contains a single element for all $v \in F^0$.) Thus $C^*(\mathcal{Q}') \cong C^*(G \times U)$ and by Remark 3.24 we see that $C^*(\mathcal{Q}') \cong C^*(G) \otimes C_0(U)$. Furthermore, it follows from [25, Lemma 2.4] that $C^*(G) \cong C(\mathbb{T}, M_n(\mathbb{C})) \cong C(\mathbb{T}) \otimes M_n(\mathbb{C})$. Hence $C^*(\mathcal{Q}') \cong C(\mathbb{T}) \otimes M_n(\mathbb{C}) \otimes C_0(U)$.

Because $C(\mathbb{T})$ has uncountably many ideals, it follows that $C^*(\mathcal{Q}') \cong C(\mathbb{T}) \otimes M_n(\mathbb{C}) \otimes C_0(U)$ has uncountably many ideals. Furthermore, since $C^*(\mathcal{Q}')$ is Morita Equivalent to $\mathcal{I}_{U'}$, and because the ideal structures of Morita equivalent C^*-algebras are isomorphic via the Rieffel correspondence, it follows that $\mathcal{I}_{U'}$ contains uncountably many ideals. Since $\mathcal{I}_{U'}$ is an ideal in the C^*-algebra $C^*(\mathcal{Q})$, it then follows that $C^*(\mathcal{Q})$ has uncountably many ideals. But this contradicts the fact that $C^*(\mathcal{Q})$ is simple. Hence $\mathcal{Q}$ must satisfy Condition (L). □

References

[1] V. Arzumanian and J. Renault, *Examples of pseudogroups and their C^*-algebras*, in *Operator Algebras and Quantum Field Theory*, Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei (Roma, July 1–6, 1996), Editors: S. Doplicher et alii, International Press, 1997.

[2] V. Arzumanian and and A. Vershik, *Factor representations of the crossed product of a commutative C^*-algebra with its endomorphism semigroup*, (Russian) Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR **238** (1978), 513–516.

[3] V. Arzumanian and and A. Vershik, *Star algebras associated with endomorphisms*, in *Operator algebras and group representations*, Vol. I (Neptun, 1980), 17–27, Monogr. Stud. Math., 17, Pitman, Boston, MA, 1984.

[4] T. Bates, J. H. Hong, I. Raeburn, and W. Szymański, *The ideal structure of C^*-algebras of infinite graphs*, Illinois J. Math **46** (2002), 1159–1176.

[5] T. Bates, D. Pask, I. Raeburn, and W. Szymański, *The C^*-algebras of row-finite graphs*, New York J. Math. **6** (2000), 307–324.

[6] E. Blanchard, *Déformations de C^*-algèbras de Hopf*, Bull. Soc. Math. France **124** (1996), 141–215.

[7] B. Brenken, *C^*-algebras associated with topological relations*, preprint.

[8] V. Deaconu, *Groupoids associated with endomorphisms*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **347** (1995), 1779–1786.

[9] V. Deaconu, *A path model for circle algebras,* J. Operator Theory **34** (1995), 57–89.

[10] V. Deaconu, *Generalized Cuntz-Krieger algebras*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **124** (1996), 3427–3435.

[11] V. Deaconu, *Continuous graphs and C^*-algebras*, in *Operator theoretical methods (Timişoara, 1998)*, 137–149, Theta Found., Bucharest, 2000.

[12] V. Deaconu and P. Muhly, *C^*-algebras associated with branched coverings*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **129** (2001), 1077–1086.

[13] J. Dixmier, C^*-algebras, North-Holland Publishing Company, Amsterdam, 1977.

[14] D. Drinen and M. Tomforde, *The C^*-algebras of arbitrary graphs*, Rocky Mountain J. Math., to appear.

[15] J. Dugundji, Topology, Allyn and Bacon, Inc., Boston, 1966.

[16] R. Exel, *A new look at the crossed product of a C^*-algebra by an endomorphism*, preprint.

[17] R. Exel, *Crossed-products by finite index endomorphisms and KMS states,* J. Funct. Anal. **199** (2003), 153–188.

[18] N. Fowler, M. Laca, and I. Raeburn, *The C^*-algebras of infinite graphs*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **8** (2000), 2319–2327.

[19] N. Fowler, P. Muhly, and I. Raeburn, *Representations of Cuntz-Pimsner algebras*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **52** (2003), 569–605.

[20] N. Fowler and I. Raeburn, *The Toeplitz algebra of a Hilbert bimodule*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **48** (1999), 155–181.

[21] R. Fox, *Covering spaces with singularities*, Algebraic geometry and topology, Princeton, 1957, 243–247.

[22] P. Gabriel, *Unzerlegbare Darstellungen I* (Oberwolfach 1970), Manuscr. Math. **6** (1972), 71–103.

[23] P. Hajac, R. Matthes and W. Szymański, *Quantum real projective space, disc and spheres*, Algebr. Represent. Theory **6** (2003), 169–192.

[24] J. H. Hong and W. Szymański, *Quantum spheres and projective spaces as graph algebras*, Comm. Math. Phys. **232** (2002), 157–188.

[25] A. an Huef and I. Raeburn, *The ideal structure of Cuntz-Krieger algebras*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems **17** (1997), 611–624.

[26] T. Kajiwara, C. Pinzari, Y. Watatani, *Ideal structure and simplicity of the C^*-algebras generated by Hilbert bimodules*, J. Funct. Anal. **159** (1998), 295–322.

[27] T. Kajiwara and Y. Watatani, *C^*-algebras associated with complex dynamical systems*, preprint.

[28] T. Katsura, *A class of C^*-algebras generalizing both graph algebras and homeomorphism C^*-algebras I, fundamental results*, preprint (2002).

[29] T. Katsura, *A construction of C^*-algebras from C^*-correspondences*, Contemp. Math., Proceedings of the AMS conference "Advances in Quantum Dynamics", to appear.

[30] T. Katsura, *On C^*-algebras associated with C^*-correspondences*, preprint (2003).

[31] T. Katsura, *Ideal structure of C^*-algebras associated with C^*-correspondences*, preprint (2003).

[32] A. Kumjian and D. Pask, *Higher rank graph C^*-algebras*, New York J. Math. **6** (2000), 1–20.

[33] A. Kumjian and D. Pask, *Actions of $\mathbb{Z}^k$ associated to higher rank graphs*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems, to appear.

[34] A. Kumjian, D. Pask, and I. Raeburn, *Cuntz-Krieger algebras of directed graphs*, Pacific J. Math. **184** (1998), 161–174.

[35] A. Kumjian, D. Pask, I. Raeburn, and J. Renault, *Graphs, groupoids, and Cuntz-Krieger algebras*, J. Funct. Anal. **144** (1997), 505–541.

[36] E. C. Lance, Hilbert C^*-modules: A toolkit for operator algebraists, London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, vol. 210, Cambridge University Press, 1995.

[37] M. H. Mann, I. Raeburn and C. E. Sutherland, *Representations of finite groups and Cuntz-Krieger algebras,* Bull. Austral. Math. Soc. **46** (1992), 225–243.

[38] M. H. Mann, I. Raeburn and C. E. Sutherland, *Representations of compact groups, Cuntz-Krieger algebras, and groupoid C^*-algebras* in Miniconference on probability and analysis (Sydney, 1991), 135–144, Proc. Centre Math. Appl. Austral. Nat. Univ., **29**, Austral. Nat. Univ., Canberra, 1992.

[39] P. Muhly and B. Solel, *Tensor algebras over C^*-correspondences (representations, dilations, and C^*-envelopes)*, J. Funct. Anal. **158** (1998), 389–457.

[40] P. Muhly and B. Solel, *On the Morita Equivalence of Tensor algebras*, Proc. London Math. Soc. **81** (2000), 113–168.

[41] P. Muhly and M. Tomforde, *Adding tails to C^*-correspondences*, preprint (2002).

[42] D. Pask and C. E. Sutherland, *Filtered inclusions of path algebras; a combinatorial approach to Doplicher-Roberts duality*, J. Operator Theory **31** (1994), 99–121.

[43] G. Pedersen, C^*-algebras and their Automorphism Groups, Academic Press Inc., New York, 1979.

[44] M. V. Pimsner, *A class of C^*-algebras generalizing both Cuntz-Krieger algebras and crossed products by $\mathbb{Z}$*, Fields Institute Comm. **12** (1997), 189–212.

[45] I. Raeburn, *On the Picard Group of a Continuous Trace C^*-algebra*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **263** (1981), 183–205.

[46] I. Raeburn and W. Szymański, *Cuntz-Krieger algebras of infinite graphs and matrices*, preprint (2000).

[47] I. Raeburn and D. P. Williams, Morita Equivalence and Continuous-Trace C^*-Algebras, Math. Surveys & Monographs, vol. 60, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, 1998.

[48] J. Renault, *Représentations des produits croisés d'algèbres de groupoides*, J. Operator Theory **25** (1987), 67–97.

[49] J. Renault, *Cuntz-like algebras,* in *Operator theoretical methods (Timişoara, 1998)*, 371–386, Theta Found., Bucharest, 2000.

[50] A. Vershik, *Multivalued mappings with invariant measure (polymorphisms) and Markov operators* (Russian), in *Problems of the theory of probability distributions*, IV. Zap. Naučn. Sem. Leningrad. Otdel. Mat. Inst. Steklov. (LOMI) 72 (1977), 26–61, 223.

Department of Mathematics, University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA 52242-1419, USA
E-mail address: `tomforde@math.uiowa.edu`
E-mail address: `pmuhly@math.uiowa.edu`